

JESUS' CONCEPTION OF MAN IN THE
SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

by

DAVID K. ALLEN, B.A., S.T.B.

(Fellow of the Western Theological Seminary)

MARCH 1928.

Degree conferred 28th June, 1928.



PREFACE

This thesis is a study of Jesus' Conception of Man in the Synoptic Gospels. No effort is made to consider in detail the teaching of the Fourth Gospel or the other books of the New Testament. There are occasional references to various books of the Bible, but these are incidental to our study. Within the Synoptics, our emphasis is on the teaching of Jesus, and the words of the Evangelists have value only as they throw light on what He has to say. Our field is narrowed further by the fact that our interest in the teaching of Jesus is limited to such passages as deal with His conception of man.

While in one sense our field is quite narrow, yet, in another, it is very large. Man's importance in the thought of Jesus is so great that most of His teaching is concerned with him. Because this is true, it is impossible to treat the subject in great detail; consequently our study aims only to present the main points in His conception of man, and to give the evidence which proves that He held these opinions.

The chapters which follow are self explanatory,

but some of the peculiarities of our style should be pointed out.

In the first place, where differences exist between American and English spelling, the American is used. In doubtful cases, the authority consulted is Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary.

Throughout the thesis, words are occasionally underlined for the sake of emphasis or to call especial attention to them. When such underlined words are in quotations, it should not be supposed that the underlining is a part of the quotation. On the contrary it is ours in all cases, and is intended to aid in understanding points which have interest for our purposes.

The English Revised Version of the Bible is used for all Scriptural quotations.

In order to present Jesus' teaching as clearly as possible, a number and letter system has been used to show the relation between the various ideas. This system is as follows: The main chapter divisions are marked with Roman numerals. When these main divisions are subdivided, capital letters in parentheses are used; when these divisions are subdivided, small letters are placed in parentheses; if further subdivision is necessary, Arabic

numerals are placed in parentheses; these divisions in turn are subdivided by the use of small letters underlined; and finally, when the analysis must be carried still further, the underlined small letters are subdivided by the use of underlined Arabic numerals. Thus the symbols in the order of their strength are: I., (A), (a), (1), a, 1. The only exception to the regular use of this system has been in cases where the capital letters have been omitted. In such cases, the main divisions marked by Roman numerals have been subdivided with the small letters in parentheses.

- I. INTRODUCTION.
- II. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MAN.
- III. MORAL FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR SIN.
- IV. HUMAN NATURE AND SINFULNESS.
- V. RESPONSIBILITY FOR SALVATION.
- VI. THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION FOR GENTILES.
- VII. THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.
- VIII. THE KINGDOM AND ITS SALVATION.
- IX. RECEIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOM.
- X. GIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOM.
- XI. THE SONSHIP OF MAN.
- XII. THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN.
- XIII. MAN'S WORTH TO GOD.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

SCRIPTURE VERSE INDEX.

I. Introduction.

(a). The study contemplated in this thesis is primarily historical. It is to be based on the three gospels - Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

(b). Our study covers a wide range of subjects that have been worked over and over. They include anthropology, Biblical theology, Biblical psychology, soteriology, and eschatology. Specific work has been done on the 'Bible Doctrine of Man' and the 'Christian Doctrine of Man', but none on the more limited subject of 'Jesus' Conception of Man in the Synoptic Gospels.'

II. The Sources of Our Study.

(a). The sources are not entirely satisfactory.

- (1) None of them come directly from Jesus.
- (2) They are not the work of His immediate disciples or companions.
- (3) The mistake of undervaluing the sources.

(b). Two causes of the disciples failure to make records.

- (1) The expectancy of the Parousia.
- (2) The lesser need while those who knew Jesus in the flesh still lived.

(c). The nature of the first records.

- (1) The first records were collections of Jesus' words, parables, or incidents from His life, intended for use in the churches.
- (2) The origin of Q.
- (3) The existence of other sources is known but their content is uncertain.

Summary of the sources.

III. The Relation Between the Sources.

(a). Mark is the oldest gospel. The approximate dates of each of the three. Matthew and Luke use Mark and Q.

(b). The extra material of Matthew and Luke that Streeter calls 'M' and 'L'.

(c). Our study is not concerned with the Pauline writings or the Fourth Gospel.

(d). No distinction is to be made in our study of the value of the various sources except to favor Mark where Matthew and Luke differ from him in material included in all three and evidently coming from Mark.

IV. The Relation of Jesus to the Old Testament.

(A). A consideration of Jesus' relation to the Old Testament is necessary in the study of any phase of the teaching of Jesus.

(a). He was educated in the literature of the Old Testament.

(b). He accepted its religious teaching.

- (1) The broader features of its conception of God.
- (2) Its account of the history of the nation.
- (3) Its psychological ideas.
- (4) Much of its ethical teaching.

(c). Jesus selected from the Old Testament the elements of higher ethical value.

V. The Relation of the Teaching of Jesus to the Non-canonical Literature and Other Sources.

He was little affected by Greek, Roman, or Egyptian systems of thought, but was influenced to some extent by the Non-canonical literature of His own people. He accepted its conception of a resurrection and a future life.

VI. The Viewpoint of Jesus' Conception of Man.

(a). In harmony with the Old Testament, Jesus always

thinks of man as a religious being.

(b). A distinction between the natural man and the redeemed man is found throughout the teaching of Jesus.

VII. Old Testament Material Presupposed in the Teaching of Jesus Which has Specific Value for His Conception of Man.

(A). Teaching About the Origin of Man.

(a). Lack of evidence that Jesus ever discussed the matter.

(b). Passages which bear on the subject.

(c). The creation stories of the Old Testament are assumed in Jesus' general philosophy of the world.

(d). They are also assumed in Jesus' attitude to man.

(e). Suggested by the use of the terms 'Father' and 'Son'.

(B). Man Made After the Divine Image.

(a). The idea is not found in the teaching of Jesus, but is an essential feature of the creation narrative.

(b). Jesus treated man as if he had a god-like element in him.

(c). The difference between man made in the image of God, and the image of God in man.

(d). Probable anthropomorphism of the image idea.

(e). Little to be made of the difference between 'image' and 'likeness'.

(f). The image of God was not lost in the Fall.

(g). Speculation on the exact meaning of the image of God in man is useless.

Summary.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTIONI.- Introduction.

(a). The study contemplated in this thesis is primarily historical. We are to consider Jesus' conception of man in the Synoptic Gospels, that is, our study will be based on - Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The Fourth Gospel and the other books of the New Testament, although they will be used occasionally to throw light on the Synoptic teaching of Jesus, are not primary sources. Even within the Synoptics there is a distinction in the value of the materials, for it is obvious that the actual teaching of Jesus is of greater importance for our purposes than that which has the authority of the Evangelists. Because our

approach to the teaching of Jesus is historical, we are not concerned with the ultimate truth of any idea found in it any more than if we were studying the opinions of an ordinary individual. We do not mean that the teaching of Jesus does not have a truth value for religion greater than that which might be found in the words of any other man, but merely that the purpose of this thesis is to ascertain historical rather than ultimate truth.

(b). The field of our study is by no means a new one. It includes anthropology, Biblical theology, Biblical psychology, soteriology, and eschatology. Each of these fields has been explored many times by able scholars, and the results of their study of the doctrine of man has had careful consideration in volumes on the Biblical doctrine of man, and the Christian doctrine of man, and the results of these studies will be gratefully used here. But although these general fields have been worked very carefully, and even the subject of Jesus' conception of man in the Synoptics has been given some consideration in various books; yet, so far as we can learn, no one has ever made a thorough study of this particular phase of the larger problem.

II.- The Sources of Our Study.

(a). The sources with which we must work, if we would understand the teaching of Jesus, are not altogether satisfactory. If we desire to understand the ideas of some modern writer, we can learn what they are by reading his books. We know that we are dealing directly with the man's words and thoughts, and can be reasonably certain as to his opinions. Even if we are dealing with such a Biblical writer as Paul, we can set forth his thought with confidence, for we know that many of the books of the New Testament were the work of his pen.

(1). This is not true of the teaching of Jesus. Not one of our sources comes directly from Him, and we do not know that He ever wrote a single sermon or even a letter. He was not a writer; consequently we are left without the best of all sources of a man's ideas and opinions.

(2). If we cannot have the testimony of a man's works, the source next in importance would be the writings of those who knew him and heard him speak, and, perhaps, made notes at the time of the things which he said and did. But in this also, our sources for the teaching of Jesus are a disappointment. So far as we

know, none of those who were companions of Jesus and heard His words ever felt called upon to put them into writing. Not one of our gospels (unless one holds that John, the disciple of Jesus, wrote the Fourth Gospel) was written by anyone who had known Jesus in the flesh; they are all works of a later generation.

(3). But although we have no works written by Jesus Himself or by His companions and friends, our sources are not so lacking in value as one might suppose. There can be little doubt that the Synoptics contain a considerable body of the authentic teaching of Jesus. We may not have His exact words (in fact, because He spoke in Aramaic, we cannot have them), but we can be reasonably certain that we do have His meaning.

(b). If the question be raised as to why the disciples did not make written records it is difficult to give an entirely satisfactory answer.

(1). One reason probably is that they believed that the Parousia would take place in their generation, and they felt that it was useless to treasure the words of One who would be with them again so soon.

(2). A second reason was that, so long as those who had known Jesus personally were still alive and could tell

the story of His life and teaching, the need for written records was not felt keenly. As the years passed by, however, without the Parousia taking place and those who had been companions of Jesus passed away, the need for written records began to be felt.

(c).

(1). It would seem that the first records about Jesus were collections of His words, parables, or incidents from His life made for the use of the churches in the different cities to which the followers of Jesus had gone. It is probable that many of these were in oral form for many years before they were written, and it was the need of the churches of a manual for teaching that led to the first copies being made. Probably much of the material in these collections would be common to all, but there would be peculiarities of tradition in each church due to the channel through which their collection had come and the influence of the church upon it.

(2). After a time these traditions, or part of them, were gathered into a single collection. Eusebius (Hist. iii. 39) quotes Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, as saying, "Matthew, in the Hebrew dialect, compiled the Logia." This compilation is thought by some scholars to be

identical, or nearly so, with the hypothetical source of our Synoptics called 'Q'.¹ It is certain that it is not to be identified with our present Matthew.

(3). It is impossible to know what other sources may have been in existence before our present gospels were written. That there were such is shown by the opening words of the preface to the gospel of Luke in which he speaks of the many who "have taken in hand to draw up a "narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us." Of these early gospels, only Mark and possibly Matthew have survived.

In brief the situation is this: We have no writings of Jesus Himself, or of His disciples, and none of the original collections of the teaching of Jesus have been preserved in their original form. Our gospels were all written by men who used these first collections as sources, and wrote at a period thirty to a hundred years after the death of Jesus. But granting that these things are true, there is no reason to suppose the tradition found in the sources which our writers used was not reliable; and, when we have allowed for the changes that

1. The name 'Q' is derived from the German word 'quelle', meaning source.

would be made in passing through several hands, and for the modifications that would be caused by the tradition not being written until many years after the events occurred or the words were spoken, we still have a large residue of words and incidents which we can reasonably suppose to be authentic.

III. The Relation Between the Sources.

(a). When we consider our gospels in their present form, the consensus of scholarship seems to be that Mark is the oldest. The same Papias quoted above is responsible for the tradition that Mark was the interpreter of Peter, and wrote from memory what he remembered of Peter's preaching. Whether Mark had other sources is not a settled question, although it is probable that he used Q. Matthew and Luke are later than Mark, but no agreement has been reached regarding the exact date of either. Mark is usually dated from sixty to seventy A.D., and Matthew and Luke somewhere between seventy and ninety A.D. Both Matthew and Luke used Mark as a source; in fact both of them include most of Mark. This encourages us to think that, if they treated their other material in the same way, we may have some of the original tradition in a form

like that in which the Evangelists found it. In addition to Mark, both Matthew and Luke use the other source mentioned above, namely, Q. The debt of Matthew and Luke to Q is second only to their debt to Mark.¹

(b). These are the only common sources for Matthew and Luke; but each gospel has material not found in the other, and it is surmised that each had a source or sources not available to the other. B.H. Streeter, in his book, 'The Four Gospels', calls this extra source in Matthew 'M' and the extra source in Luke 'L'. It is possible that these sources may have been oral, but it seems more likely that they were written.

(c). As indicated above, we are not concerned directly with any of the other writings of the New Testament, but it is of value for our understanding of the Synoptics to remember that the Pauline epistles are earlier whereas the Fourth Gospel is the product of a later period. Again the problem of exact dates is difficult, and need not detain us.

(d). In our use of the sources, we do not propose to make any distinction in the value of Mark, Q, M, and L.

1. The relation between the various Synoptic sources is shown in diagram form in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, Page 680.

In an historical study of the conceptions of Jesus, the value of a passage depends entirely upon its historicity. On account of the uncertainty that surrounds the development of our sources, it would be a mistake to consider a passage more historical because it occurs in one source rather than in another. It is right, however, that where Matthew and Luke differ from Mark in passages quoted from Mark, Mark should have the preference, although it may be admitted that in some cases either Matthew or Luke may be nearer the original.

IV. The Relation of Jesus to the Old Testament.

(A). A proper approach cannot be made to the study of any phase of the teaching of Jesus without an understanding of His relation to and attitude toward the Old Testament. Many of the details of this relationship and attitude will be considered as our study proceeds, but the general features of it should be pointed out here.

(a). In the first place, it is certain that Jesus was educated in the literature of the Old Testament. The gospel material on the boyhood of Jesus is meager, but sufficient. It pictures Him as living the life of an ordinary Jewish boy, being subject to His parents (Lk.2:51),

and advancing "in wisdom and stature, and in favor with "God and man" (Lk.2:52). A knowledge of the Scriptures was a necessary part of the education of every Jewish child in those days, and we may be sure that Jesus attended the Synagogue school at Nazareth and was taught the Scriptures by the local Rabbi. In addition to His school training, there can be little doubt that, as a child in a pious home, He would be drilled in the literature of His people until He knew many passages by heart. Even if we did not have these general facts about the boyhood of Jesus, His knowledge of the Old Testament is proved by numerous incidents in His later life. These things are so well known that we need not spend time upon them.

(b). Being brought up as a Jewish boy and educated in the Old Testament, it was natural that Jesus should accept its religious teaching. This does not mean that He did not rise to a point of great superiority over the Old Testament, but this superiority was manifested in a system that had its roots in the Old Testament itself.

(1). In the first place, Jesus accepted the general features of the Old Testament idea of God. God was a person, wise, powerful, righteous, and good. He had created the world, and its continued existence was depen-

dent upon Him. He was the sovereign ruler of the world, and He had no rivals. All things were in His hands, and He controlled them to work out His righteous purpose. It is true that in the earlier stages of Hebrew history this monotheistic conception of God had not developed; but in the prophetic period, all these elements in the character of God had been recognized, and they were the common heritage of the nation at the time of Christ. The contribution that Jesus made to the idea of God was not outside of, but within, the limits of this Old Testament conception.

(2). In the same way, Jesus accepted the general truth of Old Testament history. We need not insist that His attitude to the Old Testament was entirely uncritical, but there can be little doubt that most of our modern critical problems did not exist for Him. He speaks of Jonah (Matt.12:39-41, Lk.11:29-32), David (Matt.22:43, Mk.2:25, Lk.6:3), Solomon (Matt.12:42, Lk.11:31) etc., without raising any question of the historical accuracy of the records, and doubtless He believed them to be true.

(3). Jesus' ideas about the psychology of man are also borrowed from the Old Testament, as are those con-

cerning man's worth to God, freedom, sinfulness, etc., but inasmuch as these subjects will be studied in some detail later we will not pause for them here.

(4). Even in His ethical teaching, Jesus was greatly indebted to the Old Testament. He considered Himself to be in the line of the prophets who went beyond the strict letter of the law in their conceptions of righteousness, and He accepted their teaching and built upon it (Matt.9:13, 12:7).

(c). Although Jesus accepted the general system of Old Testament teaching, He did not hesitate to differ from it when He believed it to be out of harmony with the will of God. The Old Testament teaching is by no means a perfectly unified and co-ordinated system of truth. The revelation of God contained in it is progressive; consequently elements of low ethical value are to be found there. Jesus recognized this fact, and it led Him to discriminate very carefully between the good and the bad. He realized that some portions of Deuteronomy, the Prophets, and the Psalms reach heights of spiritual and moral discernment that are not equalled by other parts of the Book. Even the prophets had not been able to use scripture indiscriminately, and Jesus, surpassing them as

He did in spiritual insight, found it necessary to use even greater care. No better example could be found of this selective use of Old Testament Scripture than in the temptation experience of Jesus. The quotations which Satan uses are authentic Old Testament passages, but Jesus answers them with other Old Testament passages which present a higher ethical conception.

V. The Relation of the Teaching of Jesus to the Non-canonical Literature and Other Sources.

Although Jesus' debt to the Old Testament was great, it was not the only influence that affected His teaching. We cannot enter into any discussion of the various theories of foreign influence on the teaching of Jesus. It is difficult to say how much He was affected by Greek, Roman, or Egyptian systems of thought. They would have an influence no doubt, yet it does not seem to have been as great as some have supposed. So far as our study of His conception of man is concerned, this influence was negligible. This was not true of the non-canonical literature of His own people, for its influence upon Him was second only to that of the Old Testament. The chief idea borrowed from this literature was its conception of the resurrection and a future life. This

doctrine is not found in the Old Testament, but it developed in the inter-Testament period; and there can be little doubt that Jesus got it from that source. The rest of the eschatological teaching of the period also had its influence on Jesus, but this influence was not so important as that of the doctrine mentioned above.

VI. The Viewpoint of Jesus' Conception of Man.

(a). It is of primary importance for the unity of our study to point out at the very beginning the viewpoint from which Jesus regarded man. A man's viewpoint is determined by his interests. If we made a study of a biologist's conception of man, we would expect to find it concerned with biological ideas; if the conception we were studying were that of a psychologist or a sociologist, we would learn probably that he approached his subject from a psychological or a sociological viewpoint; so, in the study of Jesus' conception of man, we are prepared to find that He always regarded man as a religious being. In taking this attitude, Jesus identified Himself with the viewpoint of the Old Testament and the Bible in general, for, although other ideas about man have come into the Bible in an incidental way, the con-

ception of man's relation to God and his fellow men occupies the central place. That Jesus thought of man as essentially a religious being will be kept in mind throughout our study, and only such facts will be considered as have significance for this central idea.

(b). The only preliminary observation that needs to be made about Jesus' conception of man as a religious being is that throughout His teaching He makes a distinction between the natural and the redeemed man. These terms are never used, but the idea found in them is always present in His mind. It is expressed in such contrasts as: those who are members of the kingdom and those who are not, the sick and the well, the sheep that are safe in the fold and those that are lost, and the son who is in the home of his father and the prodigal who has wandered far away. The consideration of these natural and redeemed states and the way of passing from one to the other will constitute the main problem for our study.

VII. Old Testament Material Presupposed in the Teaching of Jesus which has Specific Value for His conception of Man.

(A). Teaching about the Origin of Man.

In beginning the study of Jesus' conception of

man, it is natural and proper to consider His ideas about man's origin. In the words of Dr. Orr: "The questions of the origin and of the nature of man are inseparably connected. Theories of origin, it is soon discovered, control in practice the view taken of man's essential constitution, and need to be checked and corrected by a careful consideration of what man is - this being into whose origin we are enquiring. Conversely the study of man's nature is speedily found to be implicated with theories of man's mental and moral evolution, which drive us back on considerations of origin."¹ What then, if anything, can be learned from the Synoptic teaching of Jesus about the beginnings of the human race and its early history?

(a). It may be said at once that there is no evidence that Jesus regarded the problem of sufficient importance to merit His special interest or attention. He was greatly interested in what man is, and what he has within him possibilities of becoming; but He had little to say about the sources from which he came. Nevertheless there can be little doubt but that Jesus made assumptions and held opinions with reference to this matter, and

1. James Orr, 'God's Image in Man', p. 33.

these opinions and assumptions may be approximately ascertained.

(b). There are three passages which bear on the subject. Mk.10:6-7 which has its parallel in Matt.19:4-5 is as follows: "But from the beginning of the creation, "male and female made he them. For this cause shall a "man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his "wife." Matt.23:35 with its parallel in Lk.11:51 reads: "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on "the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the "blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between "the sanctuary and the altar." And Mk.13:19 which reads: "For those days shall be tribulation, such as there hath "not been the like from the beginning of the creation "which God created until now, and never shall be." Doubt is thrown on the authenticity of the last passage because it is a part of the mysterious thirteenth chapter of Mark, and this verse is contained in a section which some scholars have called a little apocalypse. As will be shown, this apocalypse is believed to have been inserted into the record or woven into it by the author himself. Whether it be an authentic saying or not matters little for our purposes, for its testimony agrees with that of the other

two passages quoted. In both, Jesus seems to assume the historic truth of the creation records in Genesis. It is true that neither is primarily concerned with declaring such a belief, but the natural and almost unconscious way in which their truth is assumed is the strongest possible evidence that Jesus believed them.

(c). But even if we did not have the passages that have been studied above, we would still have sufficient evidence to justify us in believing that Jesus accepted the creation stories of Genesis, for the central idea of these stories is an essential part of His philosophy of the world. The big idea of the early chapters of Genesis is that God created the world and that all things have their root and source in Him. This idea is fundamental in the teaching of Jesus. He does not express it in definite words, but it is assumed in every statement regarding the relationship between God and the world. God clothes the grass of the field (Matt.6:30); He cares for the sparrow that falls (Matt.10:29); He stills the wind and the wave (Matt.8:26, Mk.4:39, Lk.8:24); He sendeth rain on the just and the unjust (Matt.5:45); His whole relation to the world is of such character that no other theory explains it so well as that He is its Creator.

(d). This truth, which is sufficiently clear when God's relation to the world is considered alone, is made even clearer by the study of His relationship with man. His knowledge of the nature of man, His interest in him, and, above all, His claim upon him cannot be explained in any other way than that He is man's Creator. Jesus pictures man's present and future as bound up so closely in His relationship with God that; in the absence of any suggestion to the contrary, it is necessary to suppose that the same thing must have been true in the past.

(e). Moreover the use of the terms - 'Father' and 'son'-implies that man has his origin in God. We shall see in later chapters that there is much more in these words than this idea; but there can be no question that Fatherhood implies the creation of life, and, when men are called the children of God, the idea of creation is always involved.

We are justified then in assuming that Jesus' conception of the origin of man was almost identical with the account given in the early chapters of Genesis. He may not have agreed with them in detail (in fact the two accounts differ in their details); but He accepted their main features, and an understanding of His conception can be obtained by a study of the Genesis accounts. Such a

study is unnecessary here, for the only thing in these accounts of interest for our present purpose is the fact that they picture man as a creature of God.

(B). Man Made after the Divine Image.

(a). But the record of creation which Jesus assumes in His teaching goes beyond the mere fact of creation. In Genesis 1:26-27 we read: "And God said, Let us make man "in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God "created he him." Genesis 9:6 also records the fact that man is created in the image of God. The idea is not stated in any words of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels; but, if He assumes the general truth of the Genesis stories, we are justified in believing that He thought of man, not only as a creature of God, but also as created in the image of God.

(b). This belief gains credence from the fact that Jesus treated man as if there were something God-like about him. The evidence for this will appear when we study Jesus' ideas regarding man's value and his sonship to God.

(c). It should be observed that the creation account speaks of man as made in the image of God, and not of the image of God in man. The difference ought not to be difficult to see. In the actual record the whole man is described as made after the model or image of God. In the other conception, God's image is only one element in man.

(d). It is possible that in its origin the idea of man being made in the image of God was based on an anthropomorphic conception of God, but it is probable that with the development of the idea of God the conception of God's image would become more spiritual. Certainly, for one so spiritually minded as Jesus, it would have to be spiritual to have any significance.

(e). Efforts have sometimes been made to distinguish between the image of God and the 'likeness'. Possibly some distinction may have existed in the mind of the original author of the Genesis accounts, but, if so, it is impossible for us to determine what it was.

(f). In the interest of a doctrine of sin, men have speculated as to whether the image of God was lost in the fall of Adam. Most of this speculation is based on the false assumption that God's image is something

in man rather than the whole model after which man was formed. But, even if this were not true, the proof that God's image was not lost in Adam's fall is to be seen: first, in the fact that in Genesis 9:6, murder is condemned because it would mean the destruction of one made in the image of God, and, second, in the fact that Jesus frequently uses good men as models of the character of God. Thus the father of the prodigal son and the man who hired laborers for his vineyard represent God.

(g). Theologians have spent a great deal of time speculating about the exact meaning of the image of God. We have already hazarded a guess as to its meaning to the original writer, and, with an understanding of Jesus' conception of God, it is not difficult to surmise what it would mean to Him. Nothing is to be gained by such speculations, however. The important thing for an understanding of His conception of man is the fact that He believed man to be made after the image of God. It is doubtful whether even Jesus Himself thought out the exact meaning of image.¹

1. Theories as to the meaning of God's image in man may be found in James Orr: 'God's Image in Man', p. 54, and John Laidlaw's: 'The Bible Doctrine of Man', p. 153.

It is evident then that the Synoptic teaching of Jesus presupposes these two Old Testament ideas. He assumes that God created man and that man was made in the image of God. The significance of these conceptions will become clear as our study proceeds.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MANI. Introduction.

(a). There is no psychology in a strictly scientific sense in the teaching of Jesus.

(b). The term 'psychology' is used very loosely in our study.

(c). Although there is no such thing as a 'sacred psychology', yet the Bible has a psychology distinctly its own. Its outstanding characteristic is that man is regarded as a religious being.

(d). We are not to study the teaching of Jesus from the standpoint of modern psychology.

(e). The relation of the psychological ideas of Jesus to modern psychology is not a part of our study.

(f). The relation of the psychological ideas of Jesus to the teaching of the Old Testament.

(g). The fundamental ideas of Old Testament psychology.

- (1) The personality of man is a unity.
- (2) It is accessible to external spiritual influences through other channels than the sense organs.
- (3) The idea of personal immortality is scarcely found in the Old Testament.

(h). Other influences affecting the psychological ideas of the New Testament - Jewish non-canonical literature, Greek philosophy, and Christian experience.

II. The Psychological Terminology of the Teaching of Jesus.

As in all Biblical psychology, Jesus uses four main terms - soul, spirit, heart, and flesh.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MAN(A). Soul.

(a). Soul is the equivalent of the Old Testament word 'nephesh'. Use of nephesh in the Old Testament.

(b). The Use of Soul in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

It is used:

- (1) To denote the physical life of man.
- (2) For the various states of consciousness, especially the affective.
- (3) To take the place of the personal or reflexive pronoun for the individual person.
- (4) As the bearer of the higher spiritual life.
- (5) For the permanent element in man, that is, that which survives death.

(B). Spirit.

(a). The great importance of the word.

(b). It is the equivalent of the Old Testament word 'ruach'. The use of ruach in the Old Testament.

(c). The Use of the Word Spirit in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

- (1) General. Eighteen times by Jesus.

It is used:

- (2) In the Old Testament sense of wind.
- (3) For supernatural influences capable of acting on man from without.
- (4) In the Old Testament sense of psychical life.
- (5) As an element in man. In this sense, it is:

- a. The principle of life.
- b. The highest element in man.
- c. The higher psychical activities.
- d. Used with soul to denote the inner as contrasted with the outer part of man's nature.
- e. The element in man most like God.
- f. The element which makes communion with God

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MAN

possible.

- g. The sphere in man in which the Spirit of God works.

(C). Heart.

(a). There is very little variation in the use of the word throughout the Bible.

(b). It is equivalent to the Old Testament term 'leb' or 'lebab'. The use of lebab in the Old Testament.

(c). The Use of the Word 'Heart' in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

- {1} General. Forty times by Jesus.
- {2} Once figuratively.
- {3} Never, for personality.
- {4} To denote the inner life or character in general. As such, it may denote the intellectual or the moral and spiritual life.
- {5} For the emotional states of consciousness.
- {6} For the intellectual states of consciousness in place of mind or brain as we use the terms.
- {7} To indicate the seat of volition.

(d). Summary of the use of heart in the teaching of Jesus.

(D). Flesh.

(a). Flesh is the equivalent of the Old Testament word 'basar'. The use of basar in the Old Testament.

(b). The Use of 'Flesh' in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

- {1} For the substance of a living body.
- {2} To designate human nature generally.
- {3} For a lower element in human nature when contrasted with the higher elements.
- {4} To denote relationship or connection.

Summary.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MANIII. The Conception of the Accessibility of the Personality of Man to External Spiritual Influences.

(a). Discussion of the meaning of the idea.

(A). The Influence of the Powers of Evil.

(a). Discussion of Jesus' belief in demonology, and the relation of this idea to His conception of psychology.

(b). Types of Demonic Influence.

- (1) Temptation to sin.
- (2) Causing of disease.

(B). The Influence of the Good Spiritual Forces.

A discussion of the conflict in a man's heart between the good and evil spiritual forces, and the significance of conflict.

Summary of Chapter.

CHAPTER II

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MANI. Introduction.

(a). The use of the word 'psychology' in connection with the teaching of Jesus has a tendency to suggest false ideas. Psychology in the scientific sense did not exist in the time of Jesus, and, although the researches of modern psychology and particularly the 'New Psychology' have revealed many possible contacts between His teaching and modern thought, it is clear that these are due, not to any scientific knowledge which He possessed, but to His marvellous insight into human nature. The scientific study of psychology is a development of modern times.

(b). In dealing with the psychological ideas in the teaching of Jesus then, it should be kept in mind that the term 'psychology' is used in a very loose manner. The tendency of scientific study is to differentiate. As the searchlight of investigation and research is turned on the various aspects of the different sciences, they come more and more to be regarded as sciences in themselves. Just as philosophy is said to be "the mother of "all the sciences," so each of the other sciences has produced several offspring. For this reason there is danger of confusion when the term 'psychology' is used for some of the anthropological ideas in the teaching of Jesus. As H. Wheeler Robinson has said: "In regard to the "ancient world and primitive thought in general, the study "of psychology must ignore the boundaries drawn by the "modern mind between anthropology, theology, physiology, "and philosophy."¹ In other words, if we are to understand Jesus, we must lay aside our strictly scientific methods of thinking and speaking and be content to look at man through the eyes of an unscientific age. In doing this we do not admit of any irreverence toward Jesus. If the Son of God used psychological categories less precise and exact than those of to-day, it is none the less true

1. H. Wheeler Robinson "The Christian Doctrine of Man", P. 6.

that these imperfect categories were the channels of Divine truth.

(c). But, although there is no psychology in the strictly modern sense in the teaching of Jesus, yet there are psychological ideas. In a sense, the Bible may be said to have a psychology distinctly its own, and a study of Jesus' conception of man makes it clear that to a large extent He shared the psychological inheritance of His people.¹ The outstanding features of Biblical psychology are similar throughout the whole Book, but this does not prevent a gradual development of ideas beginning with the oldest records and continuing throughout. The characteristics of this development, in so far as they have significance for Jesus' conception of man, will be pointed out as our study proceeds.

The outstanding characteristic of Biblical psychology is that it regards man as a religious being. The Hebrews were little concerned with any phase of man's mental life except those that had to do with his relationship with God and his fellow men. It was pointed out in the previous chapter that this is the viewpoint

1. This is not to be taken as meaning that the Bible contains a specially revealed or sacred psychology.

which Jesus took in His attitude toward man; consequently we are prepared to find that the aspects of the psychology of man which interested the Hebrew people were the ones of greatest concern to Jesus. In other words, in the study of Jesus' conception of the psychology of man, our field is narrowed by the fact that He was interested only in man as a child of God - lost, but capable of being saved.

(d). The teaching of Jesus about man offers a field of great interest when approached from the standpoint of modern psychology, as the more or less recent books of Barry, Pym, Valentine, and others have shown.¹ We shall have occasion to glance at it from this angle in a later chapter, but the field as a whole lies beyond the scope of our study.

(e). We must also deny ourselves the privilege of setting forth the relationship of Biblical psychology as it is found in the teaching of Jesus to modern scientific psychology. This too is a problem that has attracted students in recent years, but it would carry us too far out of our course to attempt to deal with it.

(f). As has been suggested, the ideas in the teaching

1. See bibliography.

of Jesus regarding the psychology of man do not appear on the stage of the world's history unheralded. Wendt points out: "Those ideas entirely correspond to the "popular conceptions and modes of speech of the Old Testament which were current among the Jews in the time of "Jesus."¹ Consequently we shall expect to find in the Old Testament the roots of the various ideas which will be considered.

(g). Because this is true, it will be necessary to consider several of the essential principles of Hebrew psychology before taking up the study of the psychological conceptions in the teaching of Jesus.

(1). In the first place, the Hebrews regarded human personality as a unity. In contrast to the Greek conception of man as a duality consisting of body and soul, they believed man to be a unity of which body, soul, and spirit are aspects. As Professor Laidlaw has said: "Spirit, soul, and flesh are expressions of man's nature "viewed from different points. They are not three natures. Man's one nature is really expressed by each of² "them, so that each alone may designate the human being."

1. H.H. Wendt: 'The Teaching of Jesus' Vol.I, p. 156.

2. John Laidlaw: 'The Bible Doctrine of Man' pp. 126-127.

The soul, as we shall see, was not thought of as some immaterial metaphysical entity inhabiting a body of matter, but rather it was a "quasi-physical something frequently identified... with the breath."¹ The body, on the other hand, although made up of various physical organs, was not purely physical because these organs had psychical qualities. With our modern knowledge of physiology, we are accustomed to think of the bodily organs performing physical functions only, whereas the psychical are cared for by the brain and the nervous system. For the Hebrews, however, such differentiation of function did not exist. Each physical organ had psychical as well as physical activities, and the work of the brain and the central nervous system was neither known nor understood. In fact, as Principal Robinson suggests (op. cit. p.12), the brain was probably regarded as the "marrow of the Head" and the nerves classed with the sinews. In the light of these facts, it is not difficult for us to understand why the Hebrew did not make the distinction between the physical and mental that we do, and consequently how natural it was for him to think of human nature as a unity.

1. H.W. Robinson: 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', p.6.

(2). Another principle of Old Testament psychology of fundamental importance for our study was the idea that the personality of man is accessible to external influences working in other ways than through the natural sense organs. The world was thought to be filled with spiritual beings, good and evil, and these had direct access to the inner man. This was especially true of the Spirit of Yahweh. The idea was carried over into the New Testament, and is fully recognized in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus. We shall see how important it is for that teaching.

(3). The third idea that needs to be mentioned before we take up the consideration of the psychological ideas in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus is the conception of immortality. This conception goes through a process of development within the period in which the writings of the Bible were being produced. It is very rare in the Old Testament. The dead are thought to continue to exist in a colorless, shadowy state in Sheol, but this is not existence in a real sense. In fact, the accepted idea of the unity of the psychical and physical elements in human nature made the existence of the personality apart from the body seem impossible. If a

future life were to be believed in, a doctrine of a resurrection had to arise. This development took place in the inter-Testament period, and, by the time of Christ, it had become well established except among the **Sadducees**, who denied that there was any authority for a resurrection in the teaching of Moses, and condemned the doctrine as an innovation. The point which we need to observe, however, is that the doctrine of the resurrection is a natural development of Hebrew psychology. If human nature is a unity of psychical and physical elements, a future life in any real sense would be impossible without a resurrection. When the national and individual disappointments and misfortunes of those who felt themselves to be the chosen people of God made a conception of a future life necessary, the doctrine of the resurrection had to arise to make it possible.

Other phases of the Old Testament conception of the psychology of man will be touched upon as we proceed. It is sufficient for the present to point out that Jesus accepted these three ideas and used them as a basis for His teaching. The dependence of the psychology of the New Testament on that of the Old will be further indicated as we study the chief psychological

terms in the teaching of Jesus. Most of these terms will be found to have their equivalents in the Hebrew language, and the relation between them may be studied in the first Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint.

(g). Great as was the effect of the Old Testament on the psychology of the New, it was not the only influence. Mr. M. Scott Fletcher says: "The New Testament psychology, when compared with that of the Old, shows signs of "having been influenced by three factors - Jewish non-canonical literature, Greek philosophy, and Christian experience." It is doubtful whether the psychological conceptions of Jesus were influenced in any way by Greek philosophy, but, as suggested in the opening chapter of this thesis, there can be little doubt that He was influenced by the non-canonical literature of His own people. The Christian experience of which Mr. Fletcher speaks is chiefly that of the early Church, and consequently did not affect Jesus. Yet it is certain that His views would be influenced by His own experience and knowledge of God. Such differences as may be found to exist between His conception of the psychology of man and that of the Old Testament will be found due, partly to these things, but main-

ly to His profound insight into human nature.

II. The Psychological Terminology of the Teaching of Jesus.

In common with both the Old and the New Testaments, Jesus uses four main terms to describe the various aspects of the life of man - namely, soul, spirit, heart, and flesh. Mr. Fletcher gives us a general survey of the meaning of these words that will serve as a preliminary statement for our study: "All these words gather "round the idea of life and express some special relation "to it. The soul is the subject of life. It is the "bearer of the individual life, what is now called the "ego or self. Spirit, on the other hand, is the princi- "ple of life generally, and is therefore regarded, when a "constituent part of man, as higher than soul and that "which makes man akin to God. The heart is the organ of "life, and the seat of all thinking, feeling, and willing. "The flesh is not merely the body or its material sub- "stance. It is living matter or the medium of life's "manifestation."² We shall now consider these ideas in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus.

-
1. M. Scott Fletcher: 'The Psychology of the New Testament', p.8.
 2. M. Scott Fletcher: 'The Psychology of the New Testament', p.21-22.

(A). Soul - psyche - ψυχή.

(a). In the first place, Jesus frequently uses the word 'soul' (ψυχή). This term is the equivalent of the Hebrew word 'nephesh' (נֶפֶשׁ), that is, when the Old Testament was translated into the Greek, the word nephesh was translated psyche, and when the New Testament writers use the word psyche they usually mean the same as the Old Testament meant by nephesh. As to the use of nephesh in the Old Testament, H. Wheeler Robinson says that it was used in three senses - as the principle of life, in a psychological sense and 'personal'.¹ By this he seems to mean that it was used for (1) physical and occasionally spiritual life, (2) to denote the various states of consciousness, i.e. volitional, intellectual, and affective, especially the last, (3) and in place of the personal and reflexive pronoun, or to denote the individual person. Jesus' use of psyche will be found to have appropriated most of these meanings.

(b). The Use of 'Soul' in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

(1). The word psyche occurs thirty-nine times in the Synoptic Gospels; if repetitions and quotations are -----
 1. H.W. Robinson: 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', p.16.

counted, thirty-five times on the lips of Jesus. In twelve out of these thirty-five times the word means simply the physical life of man - the first of the meanings of *nephesh* mentioned above. The following sayings have this meaning: "Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat... Is not the life more than the food?" (Matt.6:25, Lk.12:22). "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Matt.20:28, Mk.10:45); "Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save life, or to kill?" (Mk.3:4, Lk.6:9); "Whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it." (Mk.8:35 with approximate parallels in Matt.10:39, 16:25, Lk. 9:24, 17:33). In each case in which a parallel to the last verse quoted appears in the Synoptics the first use of the word life is in a physical sense, whereas the second use has a meaning which will be considered later. This use of the word *psyche* has little significance for Jesus' conception of man, but it aids in showing the relation between His ideas of psychology and those of the Old Testament.

(2). Again we find that Jesus uses *psyche* in a manner

similar to the second use of *nephesh* mentioned above, that is, to denote the various states of consciousness, especially the affective. In fact Jesus uses it in the Synoptics for the affective only. The first instance is a quotation from the Old Testament: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul" (Deut.6:5, Mk.12:30,33, Matt.22:37, Lk.10:27). Men love with their souls; it is the seat of the feeling of love. Again it is the seat of the feeling of sorrow: "My soul is exceedingly sorrowful even unto death" (Mk.14:34, Matt.26:38). These are the only instances in which Jesus uses the word in this sense in the Synoptics, but they are sufficient to show that He accepted its fundamental Old Testament meaning. The soul in contrast to the spirit is the seat of the feeling side of man - the lower feelings as well as the higher. The spirit, as will be shown, can also be used for the feeling side of human nature, but the difference between the two lies in the fact that the soul, being embodied life, is sometimes used (although not by Jesus) for the lower sensual type of feeling, whereas the spirit always designates the nobler feelings.

(3). In the third place, Jesus uses the word *psyche*

in a manner corresponding to the third use of *nephesh* mentioned above, that is, in place of the personal or reflexive pronoun, or to denote the individual person. Professor Headlam says that 'soul or psyche' "might be used as our word personality." It was "that which gave¹ permanence to man." The following are examples of this use: "For what doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self?" (ἐαυτόν) (Lk.19:25). A second saying is: "I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years" (Lk.12:19). This is equivalent to 'I will say to myself.' These are the only instances in which the word has this meaning in the Synoptics. This use of soul may be thought of as derived from the preceding ones. When the soul was both the bearer of the physical life and the seat of the various conscious states, it was natural to regard it as the self. As Fletcher says:² "The soul was that in each man which both lived and felt." Consequently the soul came to be thought of as the personality, the life embodied, the man himself.

(4). Again Jesus uses the word *psyche* as the bearer

-
1. Headlam, 'The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ', p.121.
 2. M. Scott Fletcher, 'The Psychology of the New Testament', p.35.

of the higher spiritual life. This use seems to have been included in the first use of *nephesh* mentioned above although it was rare in the Old Testament. The chief examples of its use in this sense are as follows: the second use of the word in Mark 8:35, Matt.10:39, 16:25, Lk.9:24, 17:33); "For what doth it profit a man, to "gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? For what should a man give in exchange for his life? (Mk.8:36-37, Matt.16:26). "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; "for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find "rest unto your souls" (Matt.11:29); "And be not afraid "of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the "soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both "soul and body in hell" (Matt.10:28); "Thou foolish one, this night is thy soul required of thee" (Lk.12:20); "For the life is more than the food, and the body than the "raiment" (Lk.12:23); and finally, "In your patience ye "shall win your souls" (Lk.21:19). In some of these verses the translators have recognized this meaning of *psyche* by translating it "life" instead of soul. This use of the word is the most important one in the teaching of Jesus. It was involved in the conception of the soul as the self, for the spiritual life belonged to the self as truly as the

physical.

(5). Finally, the soul is sometimes spoken of in the teaching of Jesus as that which is permanent in man - that which will continue after death. As was previously suggested, the word *nephesh* has no meaning corresponding to this. A long period of development resulting in a doctrine of a resurrection had to take place before this meaning of *psyche* was possible. The word is used in this sense in the following sayings: "And be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt.10:28); "For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it" (Mk.8:35, Matt.10:39, 16:25, Lk.9:24, 17:33). It should not be supposed that these verses imply that the soul could exist apart from the body, but, in view of the fact that the body would be raised in the resurrection, the soul was the indestructible element in man.

These five uses of the word *psyche* are found in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus. The first four are taken directly from the psychology of the Old Testament, whereas the fifth is an advance over Old Testament ideas. The

relation of the word to the other psychological ideas in the teaching of Jesus will be made clear as our study proceeds.

(A). Spirit - pneuma - πνεῦμα.

(a). The second term which we shall consider because of its psychological significance in the teaching of Jesus is 'spirit' - pneuma (πνεῦμα). This word has a greater range of usage than any of the other words we are considering, and it is much more important for Jesus' conception of man. The terms soul, heart, and, in most of its uses, the term flesh, apply to elements in or qualities of man, but the term spirit is not only a quality of man but it has other uses which are even more important.

(b). The word is the equivalent of the Old Testament term 'ruach' (רוּחַ). Quoting again from H. Wheeler Robinson: in the Old Testament "It occurs 378 times, denoting (A) wind, natural or figurative (131); (B) supernatural influences acting on man, rarely on inanimate objects (134); (C) the principle of life (like nephesh) or of its energies (39); (D) the resultant psychical life (74)."¹ The term 'neshamah' (נֶשָׁמָה), a synonym of ruach, is used twenty-four times in the Old Testament.

1. H.W. Robinson, 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', p.18.

Its range of usage, however, is not great, nor its meaning important for our study.

(c). The Use of 'Spirit' in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

(1). The word spirit occurs fifty-eight times in the Synoptic Gospels, but only eighteen times on the lips of Jesus. It might be argued that it was a more important idea to the Evangelists than to Jesus Himself, but, when the evidence is considered as a whole, there is no reason to believe that this is true. Jesus' use of the word corresponds, for the most part, with the Old Testament, but there is evidence of a development.

(2). The first Old Testament meaning of spirit -
(A) wind, natural or figurative - is not found at all in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus. He is reported to have used the word in this sense in John 3:8, but not elsewhere. The Greek uses 'anemos' (ἀνέμος) to express the idea of wind, and pneuma is reserved for higher and nobler purposes. It is possible that (A) (see Robinson's summary above) should be included in (6) in the teaching of Jesus, for, in-so-far as He regarded the spirit as 'quasi-physical', He probably thought of it as breath-like.

The dependence of the psychology of Jesus on that of the Old Testament is shown, however, by the fact that He uses the term spirit in each of the three remaining senses mentioned above.

(3). Two thirds of these uses correspond to the Old Testament sense (B), that is, supernatural influences acting on man from without. This is a very important meaning of the word, and these passages have great significance for our study; but the discussion of them will be deferred until we have completed the consideration of the terms which Jesus applies to the physical constitution of man.

(4). Before considering the use of the word spirit for an element in man as suggested by (C) above, we shall discuss the instances in which Jesus seems to have used it in the sense of (D), that is, as psychical life. The first of these sayings is Matthew 22:43: "How then doth David in "the Spirit call Him Lord?" The meaning seems to be, How then doth David "under inspiration" call Him Lord?¹ Spirit is the psychical experience of David resulting from the influence of the Spirit of Yahweh upon him. The other instance is Matthew 5:3: "Blessed are the poor in spirit."

1. H.B. Swete, 'The Holy Spirit in the New Testament,' p.121.

The authenticity of this saying is made doubtful by the fact that Luke gives it: "Blessed are ye poor" (Lk.6:20). If Luke's version is correct there would be only one verse in the Synoptics in which Jesus used the word spirit in this sense. But, even if Luke be correct, it is probable, as W.C. Allen suggests, that Matthew has given a true interpretation of the original saying. Certainly there is no discord between Matthew's words and the rest of the teaching of Jesus.^{1&2}

(5). Finally, Jesus uses spirit in a manner corresponding to the use of the other psychological terms which we are considering, that is, as a normal element in man. It is equivalent to the third meaning of ruach (C) mentioned above - the principle of life or its energies. Jesus uses the word in this sense three times in the Synoptic Gospels. The verses are: "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Lk.14:38, Matt.26:41); "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost" (Lk.23:46). In each of these cases it is evident that the spirit is an element in man. What this element is, will be the next point of consider-

ation for our study.

If the Synoptics were the only material available for an understanding of Jesus' use of the word spirit in the sense we are considering here, it would be impossible to gather much information about it. When we consider, however, that there is a system of psychological ideas the main features of which are similar throughout the whole Bible, it will become clear that we can be reasonably sure of most of the points in Jesus' conception even when there is little or no direct evidence. What then is the spirit when thought of as an element in man?

a. The Old Testament leaves no reason to doubt that the spirit is the principle of life - the God imparted life of man. The soul, it has been shown, is embodied life, that is, life thought of as a principle united with other elements to constitute the personality. The spirit is the principle itself. That this is true is indicated by the account of man's creation: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen.2:7). The spirit existed before God breathed

1. Int.Crit. Commentary, St. Matthew, p.39.

2. See also note at bottom page 160, Vol.I, Wendt, op. cit.

it into the form He had made, but the soul did not exist until the spirit and body were united. The spirit is life, whereas the soul is the same life bodily conditioned. Wendt confirms this interpretation when he says: "According to the Old Testament usage, this term 'spirit' "was applied to the inner spiritual life of man, the soul, "especially when it was not considered in respect of its "individuality, but of its higher Divine nature and ori-¹gin."

b. It is possible that the creation account does not imply anything more concerning the spirit in man than that it came from God. The vitalizing principle in man was God-given. This fact in itself gives a value to man's spirit which is not possessed by any other element in his nature. This is brought out in one of the verses quoted above: "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Without casting any shadow on the essential unity of human nature, the highest element - the spirit - is contrasted with the lowest - the flesh.

c. Again, as was suggested, the spirit may designate the higher psychical activities of man. It has been shown that the word soul is used to denote the seat

1. H.H. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol.I, p.160.

of the affective states of consciousness. It can be used for cognition and conation as well as feeling, but its most frequent use is for the latter. As the seat of feeling, it may stand either for the lower physical or the higher and more spiritual feelings. In the Pauline writings, this quality leads Paul to use the adjective $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}s$ to denote the lower or sensual side of man's nature in contrast to $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}s$ for the higher or spiritual side (I Cor. 15:44). The word spirit, on the other hand, is used more frequently for the cognitive and conative as well as the affective states of consciousness, and, when used for the affective, usually means the higher and more spiritual feelings. The Old Testament affords a number of illustrations of such usage. In Psalm 77:6, we find the expression: "My spirit made diligent search." This is a strong statement of both conation and cognition. In Psalm 106:33, the higher emotional side of personality is suggested by the provocation of the spirit. This is also indicated by "the heat of my spirit" in Ezekiel 3:14. Again, the spirit has a cognitive function in Proverbs 17:27, and a conative function in Isaiah 19:14. The same general facts are true of the teaching of Jesus. In Mk. 14:38 and Matt. 26:41, all three functions of the mind

are involved in the use of the word 'willing' (πρόθυμον), although the conative is usually regarded as predominant while this is the only saying of Jesus that is applicable to the point, yet it is sufficient to show His conformity to the customary practice. The reason for this tendency to think of the soul as the seat of the affective states of mind, whereas the spirit could mean any one of the three, is probably the fact that the soul is embodied life and, being so closely associated with the body, it was natural to identify it with the feelings of the body. The spirit, on the other hand, being the principle of life itself, could be thought of as the seat of all the states of mind, and, in the light of its origin, when it was the seat of the feelings, it would be the higher and more God-like feelings.

d. Another point of comparison between soul and spirit is their use to denote the inner as contrasted to the outer part of the nature of man. When used in this way, the two words are practically synonymous. Thus in Matthew 10:28, Jesus speaks of those that "kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." And in Matthew 26:41, He contrasts spirit and flesh in the same way. Illustrations might be given from the Old Testa-

ment, but the point is clear without them.

e. Again, the spirit is that element in man which is most like God. The life which God breathes into man has affinities to its higher side with His own life. Actually it may be little more than the life of an animal, but it has potentialities for relationship with God which the animal does not possess. The strongest indication of this potential relationship is in the use of the same word for both. It is not a matter of chance that the word spirit is used both for the human spirit and the Spirit of God, but is due to the intimate relationship that is believed to exist between them.

f. It was through this essential likeness in nature that communion with God is possible. This thought is expressed in John 4:24: "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." In Isaiah 26:9, the writer speaks of seeking the Lord in his spirit. There is no direct statement of the idea in the Synoptics, although in Mark 14:38 and Matthew 26:41 prayer to God is connected with the maintenance of the eagerness of the spirit.

g. Finally, the spirit is the sphere in man in which the Spirit of God works. This is not to regard it as a

religious faculty. Professor Laidlaw warns us: "It is
 "also a mistake, though one by no means so serious, to
 "make pneuma the faculty of God consciousness or the or-
 "gan of religion in man....It is evident on a general
 "view of the facts that we cannot assign religion to any
 "single faculty or power in man as its exclusive func-
 "tion."¹ This is, of course, correct. The access of
 the Spirit of God to the personality of man is to the
 whole inner man. The personality is a unity, and there
 is no special religious faculty. But, although this is
 true, yet the spirit is the Godward aspect of the uni-
 fied personality; it is the window open toward heaven.
 The most direct statement of this idea in the Bible is
 Romans 8:16: "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with
 "our spirit, that we are children of God." The idea is
 also involved in John 4:24 quoted above. It is not
 stated in the Synoptics, but there can be little doubt
 that it is assumed.

(C). Heart - kardia - καρδιά.

(a). Along with soul and spirit, Biblical psychology
 frequently uses another term, 'heart' (καρδιά).

Jesus accepted this term with most of its original mean-

1. John Laidlaw, 'The Bible Doctrine of Man', p.129-30.

ing, and uses it many times in the Synoptics. In fact there is less variation in the meaning of heart in the Bible than of any of the other psychological terms.

Laidlaw says: "This term is the one least disputed in its meaning, and which undergoes the least amount of change within the cycle of its use in Scripture."¹

(b). The term heart - kardia - is the equivalent of the Old Testament word "leb" or "lebab" (לב - לבב). Principal Robinson says that in the Old Testament these words "occur 851 times, and may be grouped in five classes: (A) physical or figurative ("midst"; 29); (B) personality, inner life, or character in general (257: e.g. "Ex.ix.14; I Sam.xvi.7; Gen.xx.5); (C) emotional states of consciousness, found in widest range (166: intoxication, I. Sam.xxv.36; joy or sorrow, Judg.xviii.20, "I Sam.i.8; anxiety, I Sam.iv.13; courage and fear, "Gen.xlii.28; love, II Sam. xiv.1); (D) intellectual activities (204: attention, Ex.vii.23; reflection, Deut. "vii.17; memory, Deut.iv.9; understanding, I Kings iii.9; "technical skill, Ex.xxviii.3); (E) volition or purpose "(195: I Sam.ii.35), this being one of the most characteristic usages of the term in the O.T."²

1. John Laidlaw, 'The Bible Doctrine of Man', p.121.

2. H.W. Robinson, 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', p.22.

(c). The Use of the Word 'Heart' in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

(1). The word heart occurs fifty-two times in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus uses it forty times. His usage includes everyone of the seventeen times it occurs in Matthew, nine out of twelve times in Mark, and fourteen out of twenty-three times in Luke. It will be shown that He accepts the word in its Old Testament sense throughout nearly the whole range of its meaning.

(2). First, He uses the word once in the Old Testament sense (A), that is, physical or figurative: "For as Jonah was three days and thre nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt.12:40). This figurative meaning of the word is of interest only because it shows that Jesus used it in all of its Old Testament senses, but since it has no significance for His conception of man, we need not consider it further.

(3). Again Jesus uses the word in a manner partially corresponding to the Old Testament use (B), that is, as "personality, inner life, or character in general."

The use of the word 'personality' in this connection is unfortunate. Jesus never uses heart to de-

note the personality of the man meaning the man himself, that is, a man is never called a heart as he is a soul or a spirit. Even the Old Testament does not use the word in this sense, and, when Robinson speaks of heart as designating personality he cannot mean anything more than the whole inner life of man.

(4). The word is used, however, in the second sense mentioned above. The Bible frequently speaks of the heart as the inner life - the physical location of the higher being, "the focus of the inner man, the center from which the whole of conduct proceeds."¹ The word is used in this sense for example in the following sayings: "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God" (Matt.5:8); "For I am meek and lowly in heart" (Matt.11:29); "Everyone that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt.5:28). Other references include: Matt.9:4, 11:34, 12:35, Mk.2:8, 11:23, Lk.8:12, 16:15. The custom of regarding the heart as the focus of a man's conscious life arose from the primitive belief that the life was in the blood (Lev.17:11). "Although it was only in modern times that Harvey discovered-----
1. James Stalker, 'Christian Psychology', p.64.

led the circulation of the blood, yet the ancients were "quite familiar with the fact that the heart was the receptacle of the blood and even the center of its distribution. Hence if the life was in the blood, the center¹ of that vitality was in the heart."

Thinking of the heart as the center of the physical life naturally led to the use of the word for the center of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual life. "By a sort of metaphorical anticipation of Harvey's famous discovery, the heart is also that in which all the² actions of the human soul return." The use of heart for the intellectual life in the broadest sense of the word will be considered in the points which follow.

It is clear, however, from the above discussion of the heart as the center of the inner life that Jesus regarded it as the seat of character. Thus He speaks of men being "pure in heart" (Matt.5:8); of having committed adultery "in the heart" (Matt.5:28); of the heart waxing gross (Matt.13:15); of "evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings," coming out of the heart (Matt.15:19,

1. M. Scott Fletcher, 'The Psychology of the New Testament', pp.76-77.

2. John Laidlaw, 'The Bible Doctrine of Man', p.121.

Mk.7:21-22); of having hard hearts (Mk.3:5); and of being slow in heart to believe (Lk.24:25). Thus it is shown that the heart is the part of man in which sin does its foul work, and consequently it is the sphere of regeneration. We find the thought in Psalm 51:10: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right "spirit within me." In the New Testament, Peter speaks of God as purifying the hearts of men by faith (The Acts 15:9). Other illustrations might be given, but these are sufficient to make it clear that, even though Jesus does not speak expressly of regeneration taking place in the heart, it cannot be doubted that He shared this generally accepted idea.

It is probable also that Jesus regarded the heart as the seat of the indwelling Spirit of God. No verse can be quoted which expressly states this idea, but it may be implied in the parable of the sower when Jesus speaks of the seed taking root in the heart. Even if specific evidence was entirely lacking, the idea is probably involved in the thought that the heart is the general organ of all the activities of life.

(5). Again, Jesus uses the word heart in the Old Testament sense (C) stated above, that is, the emotional

states of consciousness. It has been pointed out that the word has this meaning one hundred and sixty-six times in the Old Testament, and it also occurs very frequently in the New. In the teaching of Jesus, however, it is found only four times in the Fourth Gospel (Jn.14:1,27, 16:6,22) and twice in the Synoptics.

The first use in the Synoptics is the quotation from Deut.6:5: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy "God with all thy heart" (Mk.12:30, Matt.22:37, Lk.10:27). The lusting of Matthew 5:28 should also be included here, although it might be classed with the cognitive and conative states of consciousness as well as the affective. These examples are sufficient to show that Jesus used the word in this sense. This is the first of the 'intellectual' (as contrasted to the 'moral') states of mind which Jesus believed to be focused in the heart.

(6). The second of these states of consciousness is the more purely 'intellectual' activity as classed under (D) in Principal Robinson's summary of Old Testament usage. This meaning of heart is very important in Biblical psychology, and, consequently, in the psychology of Jesus. In our modern speech, we are accustomed to speak

of the heart as the seat of the feelings, and we have seen that the word sometimes has this meaning in the Bible. But the use of the heart to denote the cognitive states of consciousness is more characteristic both of the Old Testament and the New. As was pointed out, the Hebrews had no separate word for brain or mind, and all the mental functions, which we know to be performed by that organ, were attributed to the heart. In the writings of the New Testament, other words were introduced for the more specific mental functions, but they were not used by Jesus. The following sayings will illustrate Jesus' use of the word in the Synoptics in this sense: "Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?" (Matt. 9:4); "Lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts" (Matt. 13:15); "For out of the heart come forth evil thoughts" (Matt. 15:19, Mk. 7:21); "Why reason ye these things in your hearts?" (Mk. 2:8, Lk. 5:22); "And shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe" (Mk. 11:23); "But if that servant say in his heart" (Lk. 12:45); "Settle it therefore in your hearts" (Lk. 21:14); "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe" (Lk. 24:25); "And wherefore do reasonings arise in your heart?" (Lk. 24:38).

These sayings indicate that Jesus believed the heart to be the seat of the intellectual activities of man. It was the organ of a man's thoughts - both good and bad, the location of reason and understanding, the center of faith or doubt, and the scene of individual judgment. Luke 1:51 and 2:51, while not from Jesus Himself, are probably in harmony with His thought. They indicate that the heart was regarded both as the "source of imagination" and the "storehouse of memory."

(7). Finally, Jesus uses the term heart to indicate the seat of volition or purpose as in (E) of Principal Robinson's summary. The word is used in this sense in the following sayings: Matt.5:28 quoted above; "For this people's heart is waxed gross" (Matt.13:15); "This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me" (Mk.7:6, Matt.15:8); "Being grieved at the hardening of their heart" (Mk.3:5); "Their heart was hardened" (Mk.6:52); and "Have ye your heart hardened?" (Mk.8:17). These examples complete the evidence that Jesus used the word heart in every meaning which it has in the Old Testament.

(d). In summing up the use of the word in the teaching of Jesus, we find that no word in His psychological

vocabulary had greater importance. When man is regarded as an organism, 'pneuma' is his vitalizing force or energy, 'sarx', the material of which he is composed, 'psyche', the unity of the whole or the personality, but 'kardia', the organ of all the activities of his life, physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual. Jesus did not use the word as the organ of physical life in any of His recorded utterances in the Synoptics, but this meaning is so general throughout the Bible that there can be little doubt that He would think of it in this way. As we have seen, He believed the heart to be the organ of all three types of intellectual activity, but, following Biblical usage, He used it more frequently for the cognitive functions of the mind than for either of the other two. This was true to such an extent that the ordinary connotation of the word was more that of 'mind' or 'brain' than of 'heart' as we use the word to-day. We need not be troubled if Jesus does not use the term in connection with every mental function that we distinguish, for, inasmuch as His teaching is in harmony with Biblical usage, and heart is the generally accepted term in the Bible for mental activities, it may be regarded as certain that He would have used the word in that way if

occasion had arisen.

It has been shown that Jesus also thought of heart as the organ of moral life. Inasmuch as it was the seat of thinking, feeling, and willing, it was natural to regard it as the sphere of character. Morality is the ethical quality of human activity, and, because the heart was the organ of such activity, it was the seat of character. Finally, it was shown that the heart, as the organ of the activities of life, was the seat of the operations of the Divine spirit.

(D). Flesh - Sarx- σαῤῥῐς.

(a). The fourth term of importance in Biblical psychology is 'flesh' (σαῤῥῐς). The Hebrew equivalent of this word - basar (בָּשָׂר) occurs frequently in the Old Testament, and sarx is a common word in the New, although Jesus Himself does not use it often. Counting repetitions, it occurs only eleven times in the Synoptics, and one of the eleven is not in the sayings of Jesus. The infrequency with which Jesus uses the word is a fair indication of the lack of importance that He gave to it. It has a place, however, in His conception of the psychology of man, and we could not understand that conception without giving the word some consideration.

(b). The word flesh occurs in four different senses in the Old Testament. These are: (A) as the substance of a living body; (B) to designate human nature generally; (C) as a term for the corporeal or lower element in human nature when contrasted with the higher elements; (D) to denote relationship or connection. We shall see that each of these meanings is to be found in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus.

(c). The Use of Flesh in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

(1). First Jesus uses the word "sarx" in the Old Testament sense (A), that is, as the substance of a living body. Thus He says in Luke 24:39: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having." This is the primary meaning of the word, and it is one that is familiar to us. It must not be supposed that by "substance of a living body" dead matter is meant. Flesh is not used in that sense in either the Old Testament or the New. The life is as much a part of the flesh as the matter of which it is composed. Human nature is a unity, and the line between soul as embodied life and flesh as living matter is sometimes very faint.

In connection with this point it should be noted that the Old Testament has no word for body, and the

word flesh was frequently used by synecdoche (i.e. by putting the part for the whole) in place of body. Jesus speaks of the 'body' twenty-one times in the Synoptics, and, in nearly all of these cases, the Old Testament would have used flesh.

(2). In the second place, Jesus uses the word flesh in the Old Testament sense (B) mentioned above, that is, to designate human nature generally. The word has this meaning in the following sayings: "And except the Lord "had shortened the days, no flesh would have been saved" (Mk.13:20, Matt.24:22); "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto "thee, but my Father which is in heaven" (Matt.16:17). As to the significance of this use of the term, we may quote Professor Laidlaw: "Man as clothed in corporeity "is contrasted under the name "flesh" with purely spirit- "ual being, and especially with God. Hence with refer- "ence to the weak, the finite, the perishable being which "man is, this expression pervades both the Old and the "New Testament as a phrase for human kind."¹

(3). The Old Testament use of the word flesh for the lower element in human nature when contrasted with the -----
1. John Laidlaw, 'The Bible Doctrine of Man', p.110.

higher elements is also found in the teaching of Jesus.

The word has this meaning in the following saying:

"Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Mk.14:38, Matt.26:41). This use of the word to designate the weakest element in man's nature prepared the way for Paul's doctrine of the flesh as the seat of sin in man. In the idea that the flesh is weak, there is no suggestion that it is evil or sinful; that conception belongs to Greek and not to Hebrew thought. Being grounded in the faith that all things that God had made were "very good", neither Jesus nor Paul could accept any suggestion that matter is evil.

(4). Finally, Jesus uses "flesh" in the Old Testament sense of relationship or connection. The only case in which the word has this meaning is in the quotation which He makes from Gen.2:24: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." (Matt.19:5-6, Mk.10:7-8).

This use of the term needs little comment. It has much the same significance that we give to the word blood when we speak of 'the same blood flowing in the veins of two or more people' or of two men being 'blood relations'. This

idea has significance also for the relation of the human race to Adam, but its importance for our discussion of Jesus' conception of man is not great.

These four terms, soul, spirit, heart, and flesh, are the key to the psychological ideas of Jesus. The word 'mind' (διδάσκειν) is used once in a quotation from the Old Testament (Mk.12:30-33, Matt.22:37, Lk.10:27). The word 'reason' (λογίζεσθαι) occurs four times designating one of the intellectual processes carried on in the heart, (Matt.16:8, Mk.2:8, 8:17, Lk.5:22) and the word 'understanding' (σύνεσις) is used by a scribe in Mark 12:33 in place of mind in the words of Jesus. Jesus Himself does not use it. No other words need concern us here.

In the light of what has been said, it is evident that the attempt to classify the anthropology of Jesus as dichotomous or trichotomous is irrelevant, for the categories of material and immaterial do not apply. There is a higher and a lower element in man, but neither is material or immaterial. The real contrast is between that which is heavenly and that which is earthly. This fact comes out later in Paul's discussion of the 'spiritual body' (I Cor.15:44,46). If spirit were immaterial

and body material, such a phrase would be self contradictory, but, when it is remembered that the contrast is between heavenly and earthly, a spiritual body is seen to be one adapted to heavenly conditions.

III. The Conception of the Accessibility of the Personality of Man to External Spiritual Influences.

(a). In our discussion of the fundamental psychological ideas of the Old Testament, it was pointed out that the Hebrews believed that the personality of man was open to "external influences working in other ways than through "the natural sense organs". As was suggested in our discussion of spirit, Jesus accepted this idea, and we shall find that it plays a very important part in His conception of man as a religious being. In fact, no other psychological idea in the teaching of Jesus is more significant than this.

(A). The Influence of the Powers of Evil.

(a). The Synoptics picture Jesus as believing that there is a kingdom of evil spirits or demons over which Satan rules (Mk.3:22-27, Matt.12:26, Lk.11:18). Demonology has long been a matter of controversy among scholars, and there have been many who sought an escape from the idea that Jesus believed in demons. It is recognized

that the Jews shared some features of the conception with the heathen world, and consequently it is felt to be unworthy of Jesus. It is conjectured that a part at least of that which He is quoted as saying may have found its way into His teaching from the popular ideas of the time in which the tradition was taking form, and that, if He used the popular language, it was meant only symbolically.¹ It is not possible to enter into a discussion of this matter here, but, unless one is disposed to do violence to a considerable body of the teaching of Jesus, it must be recognized that He held such views. Professor Wendt says: "In contrast with the holy angels who work "for the welfare of men, according to Jesus' view, stand "Satan and his angels, the demons and impure spirits. "These are regarded by Jesus as beings of supernatural "powers, united by common interests in a kingdom at war "with the kingdom of God (Mark iii. 23 ff.). He pre- "supposes that they exert upon men an agency prompting to "evil, and corresponding to their own evil nature."²

It is the conception of the openness of human personality that makes possible the idea of the influence

1. See Beyschlag, 'New Testament Theology', Vol.I, pp.93-95.

2. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol.I, p.163.

of these evil spirits upon man. The demonology of the Hebrews has a basis in their psychology. Without the conception of 'open personality', good and evil spirits might have been conceived to exist, but their influence on man would have been greatly curtailed. As it was, however, the battle-ground between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan is in man (Matt.12:28,29, Lk.11:20-22). It is there that the demons sometimes make their dwelling, and it is from thence that they are driven by the Spirit of God who comes to dwell in their place. Paul regards sin as a supernatural principle residing in the flesh of man. But, although Jesus thinks of the flesh as being a source of weakness, yet He makes no attempt to locate the seat of the indwelling demon or demons. They simply possess the whole man, and in the same way the whole man may be "filled with the Holy Spirit".

(b). The influence that the demons or evil spirits have on men are of two kinds.

(1). First, they tempt men to sin. Jesus does not teach that this is the only source of sin in man, but it will be seen that He held this to be one of the sources.¹

This is shown, first, by the fact that He regarded Satan as His own tempter. In the story of the

1. See Bernhard Weiss, 'Biblical Theology of the New Testament', Vol.I, p.104.

temptation in the wilderness, Satan is pictured as appearing in person. The exact interpretation of the incident will always be a matter of dispute, but it cannot be denied that Jesus appears to think of Satan as the source of His temptation. Wendt says, "I am far from thinking that¹ "He does so in a mere figurative way." No doubt much in the incident is symbolical, but, in the light of the evidence found throughout the Gospels that Jesus believed in evil spirits, it seems probable that He felt that Satan was the real source of the temptation that came to Him.

The same idea is suggested by His rebuke of Peter in Mark 8:33, Matt.16:23. The words are, "Get thee behind me, Satan." Here the temptation is external and comes through the ordinary channels of the sense organs, but Satan is its ultimate source.

Jesus does not regard Satan as His tempter only; he is the tempter of all men. The evidence of this fact is not plentiful, but it is sufficient. In Luke 22:31 Jesus calls the temptations which await His disciples an attempt of Satan to sift them as wheat. Professor Stevens suggests: "Here the testing process to which Peter is exposed appears to be the stress under which he is to be -----
1. H.H. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', p.164.

"placed in deciding between the higher and lower view of "Jesus' work and kingdom".¹ The attraction of this lower view is thought of as a temptation of Satan. The power of Satan to produce spiritual indifference is spoken of in a figurative way in the parable of the sower (Mk.14:15, Matt.13:18, Lk.8:12), and in the parable of the tares, Satan is the enemy that sows the tares among the wheat (Matt.13:24-30). If the seed is the word of God, the tares must stand for the temptations to sin. If the words τοῦ πονηροῦ in Matthew's version of the Lord's prayer are to be translated 'the evil one', we would have a reference to Satan as the source of temptation to evil in general, but there is no certainty that these words should be given a personal interpretation.

These verses make it clear that Jesus regarded evil spirits, especially Satan, the head of the evil spirits, as one of the sources of sin in man. Sometimes the appeal was made through the senses, but often the evil spirits had access to the inner personality of man.

(2). Again, Jesus attributes to evil spirits the power of producing sickness and disease in man. In accordance with the conception of personality which we are con-

1. G.B. Stevens, 'The Theology of the New Testament', p.85.

sidering, He teaches that Satan or his followers can enter into a man and dwell within him in such manner that some types of sickness and disease will be produced.

Wendt says: "This mode of view was applied in a general way to all sicknesses...But especially in the case of certain extraordinary morbid phenomena, such as intermittent diseases, it was supposed that the person was so possessed and indwelt by the demon, or, in particularly bad cases, by many demons, as to be made the powerless object of their pernicious dealings and the involuntary organ of their utterances." The evidence for the fact that Jesus teaches that the evil spirits which dwell in man are, in some cases, the cause of his physical ills, is plentiful in the Synoptics. In Matthew 9:32-33, 12:22, Lk.11:14 He is pictured as curing a man possessed with a devil that made him dumb. In Mark 9:17-26, Matt.17:14-18, Lk.9:42 He casts the devil out of a boy who was a lunatic. In Luke 4:38-39 fever seems to be regarded as a kind of spirit possession, for we read that Jesus "rebuked the fever." In Mark 1:23-26, Lk.4:33-35 the unclean spirit tears the man and cries with a loud voice. The Gerasene demoniac, who is said to be possessed by a legion of dev-

l. H.H. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', p.166.

ils, tears his body with stones and cannot be tamed (Mk. 5:2-5, Matt.8:28, Lk.8:28-29). These are the only cases in which the type of disease is clearly distinguished, but there are many other cases of demon possession mentioned in the Synoptics, and there can be little doubt but that some kind of physical or mental trouble always accompanied them. Other facts about demons and evil spirits dwelling in man can be gathered from the Synoptic records, but the only thing that concerns us is the fact that Jesus believes that the personality of man is directly accessible to the influence of evil spirits, and that the effect of this indwelling of evil spirits is to tempt to sin and to produce disease. Jesus teaches neither that all sin is caused by the temptation of Satan nor that all sickness is due to the possession by devils, but that they are sometimes due to such causes.

(B). The Influence of the Good Spiritual Forces.

In opposition to the evil forces which work on the inner man, Jesus taught that there is a good spiritual kingdom which He calls the kingdom or rule of God. This idea is so important in the teaching of Jesus that a large part of the remaining chapters of this thesis will be concerned with it. Some phases of the idea however

require our attention here.

The chief features of the conception from a psychological viewpoint are as follows: we have seen that the idea that the personality of man is open to external spiritual influences through other channels than the sense organs, made possible a belief in direct temptation from Satan and in demon possession. In the same way this conception of open personality prepared the way for a belief in the work of God in the inner man. If the heart is open to external spiritual influences, the Spirit of God may enter as well as the spirits of evil. As a result of this idea, the heart of man is regarded as a battle-ground between the forces of evil and the forces of God. On the one side is Satan and his hosts who are thought to be temporarily in possession of the field; on the other is the Messianic King of the new kingdom, which is being established, and all the spiritual resources of God. Because Satan and his hosts are in control, men are in the bondage of sin and disease. But a new day is coming. The Messiah has come to establish the kingdom of God. John the Baptist preaches that this kingdom is at hand (Mk.1:15, Matt.3:2), and Jesus, conscious of His own mission, takes up the same message (Mk.1:15, Matt.4:17).

The battle has begun already, and, in the first encounter, the King of the kingdom of heaven met and conquered the leader of the forces of evil. This seems to be the meaning of the temptation of Jesus. It was not a case of the battle of one man with temptation, but the issues of that contest were important for the whole human race. It was King against king, and the victory of Jesus was the victory of the kingdom of God. This idea is suggested in Matthew 12:29: "How can one enter into the house of the "strong man, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the "strong man? and then he will spoil his house?"¹ Weiss suggests: "As it is only he who has previously bound the "strong one himself that plunders his palace, so also the "Messiah must have previously conquered Satan ... It is "more than probable that the defeat of Satan, which is recorded in the history of the temptation, is here referred "to, so that at the very beginning of His Messianic activity Jesus has broken the power of Satan on earth."² Having once established His superiority over the leader himself, Jesus, of course, can control his subjects, so we find that He is able to carry on the work of spoiling his

-
1. No cosmic dualism is involved. Satan is a "strong man", not a God.
 2. Bernhard Weiss, 'Biblical Theology of the New Testament', p.106, Vol.I.

house by casting out devild and undoing their evil work.

The more detailed study of the work of God in the human heart is reserved for consideration in later chapters. But it is well to point out here that it is the psychological conception of the accessibility of the personality to external spiritual influences that makes this work possible. Jesus believed that God might influence the inner life of men in ways that would be inconceivable according to our modern conceptions of psychology. The whole New Testament view of salvation is built around this idea, and we cannot understand Jesus' conception of man as a religious being without it. The ideas of Divine inspiration, communion with God, the indwelling of the Spirit, and the power of the Spirit of God to heal the body or change the heart are more difficult for us to comprehend than they were for the people of Jesus' day because our modern psychology gives no place to this conception.

Summary:

When we seek to summarize Jesus' conception of the psychology of man, we find that it is wholly concerned with man as a religious being. If other psychological ideas creep into the teaching of Jesus, they are incidental.

The roots of the conception run back into the Old Testament, and, although the teaching of Jesus shows an advance over the Old Testament ideas, yet it is a natural development from these ideas. The Old Testament conception of the unity of the personality is accepted by Jesus. There are not three distinct parts in man's nature or even two, but he is a unity. This unified being, however, has several aspects. He is essentially an embodied life. When this life is thought of in its relation to its material element, it is called a soul; when it is considered in the light of the source from which it comes and apart from its material element, it is called a spirit; when the substance in which it is embodied is the chief thought in mind, the embodied life is called flesh; and when the organ of the life's activity is contemplated, the word heart is used. Because the personality was conceived of as an unity, Jesus recognizes that there can be no future life without a resurrection; but He differs from the Old Testament in that He accepts the doctrine of a resurrection that had developed within the inter-Testament period. The importance of the idea of the unity of the lower and the higher elements of human nature for Jesus' conception of a future life will be considered further in the chapters which follow.

Finally, Jesus accepted the Old Testament idea that the personality of man was directly accessible to external Spiritual influences. This idea opened the way for His belief in the power of Satan to tempt men, and of demons and evil spirits to produce mental and physical diseases, and for the parallel idea that God could work on the inner life of man undoing the evil work of Satan and his hosts and accomplishing the beneficent work of regeneration.

MORAL FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR SINI. Introduction.

(A). Our study of man as a religious being limits our consideration of freedom to a single phase of the larger problem, namely, moral freedom.

(B). A Brief Survey of the Main Features of the Larger Problem of the Freedom of the Will.

(a). Jesus' teaching on freedom is in harmony with the general features of Hebrew thought in the Old Testament.

(1) God is the creator, sustainer, and ruler of the world.

(2) Man's will is free within certain limitations.

(b). The main assumptions of Jesus' attitude toward the larger problem of freedom.

(1) Man is free to carry on the various mental functions, that is, to think, feel, and will.

(2) The limitations of man's freedom. The external limitations are the physical world round about him, and the society in which he lives. The internal limitations are the laws of his own mind, and moral and spiritual limitations. These are to be discussed later.

II. Man's Freedom to Choose Between Right and Wrong.

(A). Introduction.

(a). The problem is a storm center of discussion and debate. The best introduction is through a consideration of the Pelagian controversy.

(b). The Augustinian position was that freedom is self determination - "the absence of external restraint." Fallen man is free only to do evil; regenerated man, only to do good.

MORAL FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR SIN

(c). Pelagius insisted on perfect freedom at all times to choose between good and evil.

(d). Inasmuch as the controversy occurred nearly four hundred years after the time of Christ, we should not attempt to force it on His teaching. It is of value in understanding His teaching, however.

(B). The Conception of Moral Freedom in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

(a). The limitations of the material.

(b). Statement of the problem to be considered.

- (1) Does man have a choice between right and wrong?
- (2) Are there any conditions to this choice?
- (3) If so, what are these conditions?
- (4) What is the effect of these conditions on man's responsibility for sin?

(c). According to the teaching of Jesus, neither Pelagius nor Augustine were entirely correct. Man has some choice between right and wrong.

- (1) The weakness of the Pelagian position.
- (2) The weakness of Augustine's view.
- (3) Summary of results and statement of remaining problems.

(d). The Limitations of Man's Moral Freedom.

- (1) No strictly external limitations.
- (2) The influence of external things through their influence on the inner man.
 - a. Family ties prevent a free choice between right and wrong.
 - b. Loyalty to the state may conflict with loyalty to the right.
 - c. Tradition exerts a pressure on a man's will.
 - d. Miscellaneous things which limit moral choice.

MORAL FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR SIN

(3) The influence of external spiritual forces.

- a. Freedom may be limited by demon possession.
- b. The indwelling Spirit of God may restrict man's freedom.

(4) Limitations of moral freedom due to a man's inner nature.

- a. Man's freedom may be limited by his natural constitution.
- b. It may be limited by his acquired character.

(C). Man's Responsibility for Sin.

(a). A preliminary definition of sin as "the choice of anything less than the highest known good."

(1) Is man able to choose the good?

- a. Man has a part to play in the choice between good and evil.
- b. Man's part is not the only one necessary.

(2) God always does His part; consequently the responsibility for wrong choices rests on man.

Summary.

CHAPTER III

MORAL FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR SINI. Introduction.

(A). The problem of the relation of the sovereignty of God to the freedom of the human will is one of the most interesting as well as the most difficult that can engage the mind of man. Our present concern with the problem, however, is limited by the fact that we are making an historical study of Jesus' conception of man in the Synoptic Gospels, and only such aspects of the problem as may be involved in this teaching will concern us. Our treatment of it will be further limited by the fact pointed out in the opening chapter that Jesus always regards man as a religious being. Consequently, the only phases of the

problem of real importance for our present study are (1) the freedom to choose between right and wrong, and (2) the responsibility of man for his own sin. The consideration of these two points is the purpose of this chapter.

(B). The Main Features of the Larger Problem of the Freedom of the Will.

Although our immediate interest is in the problems mentioned above, yet it will add to the clarity of our study to consider the relationship of these problems to the larger problem of which they are a part.

(a). In the first place, it should be pointed out that Jesus' ideas with reference to the sovereignty of God and the freedom of the human will are in harmony in their general features with the Hebrew thought of the Old Testament. As was indicated, Jesus' mind was saturated in the teachings of the Old Testament, and many of its fundamental ideas were taken for granted in His own thinking.

(1). Foremost among these Old Testament conceptions presupposed in the teaching of Jesus was the idea that God was the Creator, Sustainer, and Ruler of the world. It is true that this idea could not have originated before the development of a thorough-going monotheism, but monotheism had been generally accepted (although, as we shall see

later, all its implications had not been perceived) long before the close of the Old Testament period. That Jesus believed God to have created man was shown in a previous chapter. The dependence of man on God is indicated by such sayings as Matthew 6:25-34 and Matthew 10:29-31, and God's rule over man in a broad sense (in contrast to the narrow sense of the kingdom of God) is everywhere assumed.

(2). Along with this idea of the sovereignty of God, the Old Testament teaches a limited freedom of the human will. The relation of the two was never discussed. The Hebrew mind was practical rather than abstract; consequently, paradoxical ideas sometimes exist side by side. It is evident that these two conceptions limit one another, and the Hebrews seem to have taken this mutual limitation for granted without attempting to define it. Jesus accepts this idea also, and we shall see that, although He recognizes the sovereignty of God, yet He never fails to take into account an element of freedom in man.

(b). But, although in harmony with the thought and practice of His own people, Jesus never discusses the relation of sovereignty and freedom, yet the main assumptions which underlie His teaching are not difficult to determine.

The ones which concern us most will be considered in detail in the course of our discussion, but a few of the others may be pointed out here.

(1). In the first place, man is regarded as being free within a very limited sphere. He is free, first, to carry on the various functions of his mind: he can think (Matt.18:10, 20:10, 22:18,42); he can feel (rejoice Matt. 5:12, 13:20, 18:13, Lk.10:20, 15:5, be angry Matt.5:22, Lk.14:21, 15:28, mourn Matt.5:4, Mk.16:10, Lk.6:25, love Matt.10:37, Lk.20:46, etc.); and he can will (Matt.4:10, 20:32, Mk.10:43, etc.). He is also free to speak and act in accord with that which he thinks, feels, and wills (Matt.12:32, 20:4,6,7,13, 21:9, Lk.6:26, etc.). The question as to whether Jesus believes that the mental functions of men are 'psychologically determined' will be given some consideration in the discussion of the next point, but it is sufficient for the present to make clear that He believes that men have some degree of freedom along these lines.

(2). On the other hand, as indicated above, Jesus' belief in the over-ruling sovereignty of God was such that He conceives the sphere of man's freedom to be limited. These limitations are of two kinds, external and internal.

The first of the external limitations of man's

freedom is the physical world in which he lives. Jesus recognizes the practical limitations of time and space. Man's welfare depends on the providence of God (Matt.6:25-34). His body cannot be changed at will: he cannot add to his stature (Matt.6:27); he cannot change the facts of his birth (Matt.19:12); he cannot cure disease by a mere act of will (Matt.17:16). His control over the forces nature is limited (Matt.14:16-30, Lk.9:12-17, etc.).

Again, Jesus recognizes that man's freedom is limited by the social order in which he lives. These limitations include (1) the home (Matt.19:5-6, Mk.10:8, Lk.14:20, etc.); (2) the government (Matt.17:27, 22:21, Lk.12:14-17, Lk.20:22-25, etc.); (3) the church or religious group to which he belongs (Matt.16:12, 23:2-4, 34, Lk.11:46, etc.); and (4) general social limitations (debts Matt.18:24-27,30, Lk.7:41, 16:5-7, acts of others Matt.21:12, Mk.3:27, etc.).

When we turn to the consideration of the internal limitations of man's freedom, we find that Jesus recognizes that freedom is limited both by the natural constitution of a man's mind and by his acquired character.

The idea of freedom in the sense of 'unconditioned' is inconceivable; consequently we expect to find

Jesus teaching that the sphere of man's freedom is made exceedingly small by the limitations of his own mind. Among these limitations He recognizes: (1) ignorance (Matt.11:29, 12:7, 16:14, Mk.10:38, 13:28, Lk.9:55); (2) lack of insight and understanding (Matt.13:13-19, 15:14, 16, Mk.4:13, Lk.6:39, etc.); (3) lack of capacity (Matt. 11:15, 13:9, 19:12, 25:15, Mk.4:9); (4) acceptance of tradition (Matt.15:6); (5) cares (Matt.13:22, Mk.4:19, Lk.8:14), and the presence or absence of faith (Matt.21:21, Mk.11:23, Lk.8:25).

Finally, as suggested above, the teaching of Jesus reveals that man's freedom has moral and spiritual limitations such as those imposed upon it by acquired character, but, as this phase of the problem will receive consideration later, we will not pause for it here.

This brief general survey of the outstanding features of Jesus' conception of the relation between God's sovereign rule of the world and the freedom of man, although altogether inadequate as a study of the problem as a whole, will serve to orient us in the field, and prepare the way for the consideration of the two problems which are our particular concern.

II. Man's Freedom to Choose between Right and Wrong.(A). Introduction.

(a). The problem which is to be discussed in this section, although it is only one phase of the larger problem of human freedom, has been the storm center of one of the bitterest controversies in the history of the Christian Church. Because of this fact, no better approach could be made to a study of Jesus' ideas on the subject than through a statement of the opposing positions in this controversy.

It was called the 'Pelagian controversy', and takes its name from Pelagius, one of the leading disputants. His chief opponent was St. Augustine. We shall not attempt to give the history of the controversy, but shall state the leading contentions on both sides so far as they deal with the problem of man's freedom to choose between right and wrong.

(b). On the one hand, Augustine contended that the only freedom that the will of man has is that which "lies in its spontaneous self expression, the absence of external re-

¹
"straint." Freedom is self determination. Before the Fall, man was in a 'probationary condition' in which he

1. H. Wheeler Robinson, 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', p.181

was free to choose either good or evil. By the Fall, this power was lost; man's nature became evil, and his will "remains free in the single capacity to express its own evil nature. But if Divine grace renews this fallen will, it becomes free in the single capacity (so far as the renewal is complete) to express its new nature; and this alone is freedom in the deepest and truest sense."¹

(c). On the other hand, Pelagius and his followers insisted on the power of alternative choice. He says: "We have implanted in us by God a possibility (of action) in both directions,"² and Julian gives the formal definition, "The freedom of will, wherein man is set free from God, lies in the possibility of committing sin or abstaining from it."³ To Augustine's contention that the nature of man was made evil by the Fall, Pelagius replied that the Fall injured no one but Adam, and that all children are born into the world as innocent as Adam was before the Fall. It is clear, in the light of this discussion, that freedom meant something very different to Pelagius than to Augustine. For Pelagius, it was the unmotivated,

1. H.W. Robinson, 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', p.181.

2. " " " " " "

3. " " " " " "

unbiased choice between right and wrong; for Augustine it was merely the absence of such external restraint as would prevent the natural expression of one's nature. In the Fallen state, men were free to do evil only; in the completely redeemed state, when the grace of God had completed its work, they were free only to do good. Other phases of the Pelagian controversy will come to our attention when we deal with Jesus' conception of sin, but these are the only ones which concern our present problem.

(d). This controversy occurred nearly four hundred years after the earthly life of Christ, and it is not to be expected that an answer to all its problems will be found in His teaching. Nevertheless, the real nature of the problem of the freedom of the will was brought out so well in this dispute that it will serve as a satisfactory guide in the exposition of Jesus' teaching on the subject.

(B). The Conception of Moral Freedom in the Synoptic Teaching of Jesus.

(a). There is no discussion of moral freedom in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus, and, as far as we know, He used no phrase with that meaning. In harmony with the general practice of His people, He never discussed abstract problems. Such discussions were characteristic of

the Greek mind, but not of the Hebrew. Jesus' interests were practical and concrete; consequently, we are forced to seek His attitude toward the problem of moral freedom among the presuppositions that lie back of specific incidents of His teaching. Even in this field our material is neither so plentiful nor so explicit as we would like, but it is sufficient to justify our faith in the truth of our conclusions.

(b). In the light of the Pelagian controversy, it is clear that the principal questions to be answered in connection with the problem of moral freedom are as follows: (1) Does man have a choice between right and wrong? (2) Are there any conditions to this choice? (3) If so, what are these conditions? and (4) what is the effect of these conditions on man's responsibility for sin? It will be noted that the first and second of these questions are so closely related that the answer to one involves the answer to the other. The other two, however, will be considered separately.

(c). What then does Jesus teach regarding the question of man's choice between right and wrong? Could Augustine have claimed rightly that he was giving a proper interpretation to the teaching of Jesus when he contended that man

had a choice only in the 'probationary' state preceding the Fall? Or was ^Ppelagius right in insisting that man¹ always has such a choice?

(1). The answer to these questions seems to be that neither was entirely correct. Only the most superficial consideration of the teaching of Jesus could lead one to think that He believed the choice between right and wrong open for each individual "to determine in each moment and "in equal manner." The evidence against this idea is² plentiful and conclusive. In the first place, it is contradicted by the faith of Jesus in the value of education. He spent His ministry in teaching. He always assumes that knowledge affects conduct, and that man's choice between right and wrong is influenced by what he knows. Especially is this true when knowledge results in a change of character. That Jesus expected His message to affect such changes is indicated by the fact that He was surprised at the inability of His disciples to understand His parables and act accordingly (Lk.4:13); that He marvelled

-
1. Julius Müller, 'The Christian Doctrine of Sin', Vol.II, p.40. "Heander finds one of the roots of the Pelagian system to consist in its conception of moral freedom as the ability to determine in each moment and in equal manner between good and evil."
 2. On page 42 of this volume, Müller has a very suggestive discussion of the weakness of the Pelagian position.

at the unbelief of the people of His own country (Lk.6:6); and that He lamented over Jerusalem because its people had failed to respond to His teaching (Lk.13:34-35). The influence of character on the choice between good and evil is clearly recognized in 'The Sermon on the Mount': "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves. By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit" (Matt.7:15-18). In addition to these arguments, which are sufficient in themselves to prove that Jesus did not believe that man's choice between right and wrong is unconditioned, there is the fact that He recognizes that man's social relations, such as those of family, religious group, community, and state, exert an influence upon him that prevents unmotivated choices. Other arguments might be used, but there is so little to suggest the extreme Pelagian idea in the teaching of Jesus that they are unnecessary.

(2). The Augustinian idea that man's nature, since

the Fall, is entirely evil, and consequently he is free to choose evil only, although there is some support for it in the teaching of Jesus, is also an inadequate explanation of the facts. In the first place, although the problem of original sin and total depravity will be considered in our chapter on sin, yet it may be said here that there is no evidence in the Synoptics that Jesus believed man to be totally depraved. The idea is suggested in Matthew 7:11: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" But, in the same saying in which Jesus calls men 'evil', He states that there is so much good in them that they know how to do something that is God-like, namely, "give good gifts" unto their children. In the same chapter His discussion of the good tree which "cannot bring forth evil fruit" (Matt.7:18) confirms this idea. The rest of the evidence is summarized in the words of Professor Stevens: "The teaching of Jesus lends no support to the doctrine of total depravity. All men are not as bad as they can be....In even the worst of men He found a spark of goodness....Zacchaeus proved himself a son of Abraham. The publican who knew himself as a great sinner went down to

"his house justified. The prodigal in his misery and rags
"had, at least, a yearning for his father's house and his
"father's love. He saw in the plain, common people the
"promise of a rich spiritual harvest, if laborers would be
"had to reap it." ¹ (See Lk.19:9, 18:14, Matt.9:37-38).

(3). It is clear then that man is neither entirely
free to choose right or wrong in the extreme Pelagian sense,
nor completely determined by an evil nature to choose evil,
or by a good nature to choose good, in the extreme August-
inian sense. Pelagius was true to the teaching of Jesus
in insisting that man has a choice between right and wrong,
but Augustine was also correct in holding that this choice
is conditioned. Our study then resolves itself into a con-
sideration of the things that limit man's choice, and, in
the light of these limitations, the extent of man's respon-
sibility for sin.

(d). The Limitations of the Moral Freedom of Man.

(1). It is very doubtful whether the idea of 'external
limitations', as used in our discussion of the limitations
of general freedom, has any significance for moral freedom.
It is true that freedom in the larger sense is curtailed by
time and space and the racial, geographical, social, and

1. G.B. Stevens, 'The Teaching of Jesus', p.113.

economic conditions under which men live, but moral freedom, inasmuch as it involves a choice between right and wrong, is not concerned with these things. We shall see presently that when they have become transformed in the inner life of man they have a great influence on his choice of action, but this influence cannot be exerted so long as they are entirely on the outside.

Because this is true, man's choice between right and wrong is never forced upon him from without. God does not compel him to choose good, and Satan never forces him to choose evil. No external force of any kind can determine his choices. The evidence for this is seen in the fact that Jesus recognizes merit in those that do well, whereas He censures those who do evil (Matt.5:4-10, Lk.6:24-26, 11:42-52). Neither merit nor demerit is conceivable if a man's choices are forced upon him from without. It is interesting to note that both Augustine and Pelagius are agreed upon this point. We would expect Pelagius to hold this position, but Robinson quotes Augustine also as saying: "No one...is forced by God's power unwillingly¹ "either into good or evil."

(2). But, although there is no evidence in the Synop-

1. H.W. Robinson, 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', p.181.

tic teaching of Jesus that He believes that external forces can control the moral choices of men, yet He did teach that these forces may so influence the inner life of man that indirectly they limit his moral freedom. This is different from external control. It is internal limitation of freedom through motives that have one root in external influence and the other in the nature of the man himself. The power of these external things to influence a man's choices lies not in the things themselves but in their appeal to the inner nature. Many illustrations might be given, but a few will suffice.

a. In the first place, Jesus taught that a man's family may indirectly limit his moral freedom. The relation of a man to his family is very complex. Among other things, it involves love, loyalty, fear for their safety, and pride of relationship. Moral freedom in the Pelagian sense, however, requires that all choices must be free from any motive other than absolute loyalty to the highest good. Confronted with two or more alternatives, a man must be free to choose the one that represents the highest value as God Himself would determine value. It is obvious that when these alternatives involve the interests of a man's family as against the interest of those

with whom he has a less vital relationship, a free moral choice is impossible. Recognizing this, Jesus taught that a man's family ties were a constant threat to his moral freedom. In Matthew 10:34-37 He says: "Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law: And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." The meaning of the saying is stated in the next verse: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." Jesus implies that loyalty to one's family may endanger loyalty to Himself, and, when the two loyalties are opposed, they make a free choice impossible.

b. Again, Jesus recognizes the influence that political affiliations can exert on moral choice. In His own life, He sought to avoid conflict between loyalty to the state and loyalty to religion. When His enemies attempted to catch Him in such a dilemma, He escaped by saying that men ought to "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and unto God the things that

"are God's" (Matt.22:21). On another occasion when He was asked to pay tribute, He agreed to do so, as He said, "lest we cause them to stumble" (Matt.17:27). But although He sought to escape such conflict, He did not find it possible. He was in constant danger from Herod, and on one occasion felt it necessary to defy him (Lk.13:32). So far as we know, He had no trouble with the Roman government until near the end of His life, but then His trial and crucifixion testify to the seriousness of the conflict which occurred. Inasmuch as He Himself was not able to avoid conflict with the state, He did not expect others to succeed better. The proof of this is found in His reference to persecution. Not all persecution would have its source in the government, but it is probable that Jesus believed that some of it would. It is obvious that, when the state persecutes those who oppose it, free moral choice is impossible.

c. The reference to persecution suggests the third type of outside influence that makes moral freedom difficult, namely, tradition. Most of the persecution from which Jesus and His disciples suffered was caused by their opposition to traditional practices. Society always exerts a pressure on individuals to conform to prevailing

traditions, and this pressure, inasmuch as it appeals to the desire to avoid conflict and to be popular, is a powerful limitation of moral freedom. The traditions which limited the moral freedom of men at the time in which Jesus lived were chiefly religious. Thus we find that, in order to carry on His work of healing on the Sabbath day, Jesus had to oppose the traditional ideas of Sabbath observance (Matt.12:1-13, Mk.2:23-28, Lk.6:1-10). In order to teach the higher truths of His own message, He had to reject some of the accepted teachings of the Jewish Scriptures (Matt.5:20-48); and He taught men that, in order to obey the higher commandments of their own law, they would need to give up favorite bits of well established tradition (Mk.7:10-11). The indifference of Jesus and His disciples toward fasting, ceremonial washings, and other external observances illustrates the same thing (Matt.9:14-15, 15:2-3, Mk.2:18-20, 7:1-15, Lk.5:33-35). Thus in Mark 7:13 He tells the Scribes and Pharisees that they make the word of God void through their tradition. In this He indicates that tradition often exercises a limiting pressure on the acceptance of the word of God.

d. Many other things might be mentioned that limit freedom by their appeal to the inner man. In the story

of His own temptation and in the feeding of the multitudes, Jesus recognizes that food and drink may be such a limitation in a time of great hunger or thirst (Matt.4:1-11, Mk.6:35-44, Lk.4:1-13). In Matthew 5:28 He presupposes that the appeal of a woman to a man's sexual instincts may be so great that purity of heart is difficult. There are a number of instances in which He recognizes that the fear of external dangers may affect a man's moral choices (Matt.10:26-28, 14:5, 21:26, 46, Mk.6:20, 11:18, 32, 12:12, Lk.19:21, 20:19. 22:2). These examples are not exhaustive, but sufficient to show that Jesus believed that, although moral choices are never forced on men by external pressure, yet external things do limit a man's moral freedom by their appeal to his inner nature.

(3). In addition to the influence of these external things, Jesus also taught that man's moral freedom may be limited by spiritual forces which work directly on the inner man. It was pointed out in the preceding chapter that the personality of man is accessible to external spiritual influences through other channels than the senses. Something of the significance of this fact has already been suggested, and it will be given further consideration when we study the work of God in the salvation of men. Its

importance for the problem of moral freedom, however, must be indicated here.

a. First, it is clear that Jesus believed a man's freedom of choice may be limited by demon possession. As was pointed out, He teaches that evil spirits may do two things to a man: tempt to sin, and produce disease. Jesus' Own experience would indicate that the method of temptation was an appeal to the inner nature of the man himself. The devil tempts man through his instincts and desires. The method by which demons produce disease is not indicated, but it seems probable that Jesus believed that when evil spirits dwell within a man they have a direct power over his body. Thus a woman is said to have been bound by Satan eighteen years (Lk.13:16), and an insane boy possessed by a devil falls into the fire or into the water and the devil is said to tear him (Matt.17:15, Mk.9:18, Lk.9:39). These incidents indicate that evil spirits may enslave a man's body, and, when this has taken place, his power of moral choice is not merely limited, but, at times, entirely suspended.

b. Again, man's freedom of choice may be limited by the indwelling Spirit of God. Augustine contended that when the Spirit of God had done His work in man's heart he

lost the power of choosing evil. No direct testimony on the point can be found in the Synoptic Gospels, but the idea seems to be implied in the good tree that "cannot bring forth evil fruit" (Matt.7:18). There can be little doubt that Jesus believed the supernatural knowledge and power which the Holy Spirit sometimes bestows on men, help them to choose the right (Matt.10:20, Lk.24:29). There is no indication, however, that the help of the Spirit of God is so great that the responsibility is lifted from the shoulders of man. If Jesus had held such an idea, the experience of the disciples after the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost would have proved Him mistaken (Gal.2:11). In the light of these facts, it is evident that He believes that the Spirit of God influences man for good, but never forces good choices upon him.

(4). In addition to the things that have been considered, Jesus taught that a man's choice between right and wrong is always limited by his inner nature. These internal limitations are of two kinds - natural and acquired.¹

a. First, Jesus taught that a man's freedom of choice is limited by his natural constitution. This has

1. The word 'natural' is used in the sense of innate, or belonging to man's nature because he is a man.

already been indicated by the facts considered. The reason that loyalty to family, state, or the traditions of one's people endanger moral freedom is that there is something in man that makes it very difficult to give these things up for the sake of a higher good. The external things that tempt man to evil have power only because man's nature is such that they seem attractive.

Ignorance is a natural limitation of another type. A free choice between right and wrong is never possible until one knows what is right and wrong. Such knowledge involves the setting up of standards of righteousness, and an appreciation of the reasons that these standards are right. Jesus recognized that men are not born with such knowledge; consequently He did not believe that all men were equally free to choose the right. If such an obvious point needed proof, it would be found in the fact that He felt it necessary to teach the difference between right and wrong, and He declared that those who had no chance to hear His message were less blamable than those who had heard it and rejected it (Matt.11:22,24, Lk.11:31-32).

b. Jesus not only taught that the moral freedom of man is limited by his natural constitution, but He also

recognized a further limitation when the natural constitution has become corrupted by sin. It has been pointed out that Jesus did not believe the natural man to be totally depraved. It does not follow, however, that He believed man to be naturally good, or that He thought him incapable of acquiring a depraved nature or character. It is possible that a man might have natural inclinations to sin without being totally depraved, and, whether he has such inclinations or not, we shall see that Jesus believed that he may acquire depravity of character. When such depravity exists, it limits a man's freedom to choose the right. A number of sayings might be quoted to prove this point, but three or four will suffice. In Matthew 7:18, Jesus says, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." This verse might be held to support an extreme Augustinian position, but it should be observed that Jesus does not say that any men are entirely corrupt or entirely good, and other passages in the Synoptics show that He did not hold such an idea (Matt. 19:17, Mk. 10:18, Lk. 13:19). Jesus does state, however, that, when a man has a good character, it is difficult to choose bad, and, when he has a bad character, it is equally difficult to choose good.

Sin conditions a man's moral freedom. The same idea is found in Matthew 12:34-35, "Ye offspring of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. The good man out of his good treasure bringeth forth good things: and the evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." In Matthew 19:8, Jesus says: "Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives." (See also Mk.10:5). The meaning is that the hardness of their hearts makes a higher standard of ethics impossible for them. Finally, in the parable of the sower, a similar meaning is involved in the thought that the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word (Matt.13:3-23, Mk.4:3-20, Lk.8:5-15). These sayings make it clear that Jesus believed a sinful character to be a limitation to a man's moral freedom.

The converse is equally true. The same sayings, which show that Jesus believed that a bad character can make good choices difficult, show also that a good character makes it hard to choose evil. This being true, no further evidence is needed.

(C). Man's Responsibility for Sin.

(a). The last problem that requires our attention in

this chapter is the extent of man's responsibility for sin. It has been shown that moral choices are neither entirely free nor completely determined, and the nature of the limitations that affect them has been discussed. In the light of these limitations, does Jesus believe that the responsibility for sin rests on man's shoulders?

Although the problem of the nature of sin will be discussed in our chapter on sin, we shall use the word in this chapter to mean the choice of something other than the highest known good. When the word is used in this sense, it is obvious that even in the realm of man's choices there is a difference between sin and evil, for, although, when man chooses something less than the highest good, it is always evil, yet it is not sin unless he knows¹ that it is less than the highest good. The attitude of Jesus toward the ignorant choice of evil was suggested in our discussion of ignorance as a limitation on moral freedom. The inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon, and Sodom and Gomorrah made wrong choices, but they did it ignorantly; consequently Jesus teaches that they are not responsible. Our problem is then: Did Jesus teach that man is fully

1. It is necessary to qualify this statement to allow for the sin of the spiritually blind. The point will be discussed later.

responsible for the choice of everything less than the highest known good? If responsibility is to have any real meaning, the question becomes: Did Jesus believe that man is able, by his own power, to choose the good in spite of the pressure that impels him toward the bad? If not, is that power supplied to the man who desires to do the good? We shall treat these problems separately.

(1). First, is man able by his own power to choose the good? This question may be divided: Does man have a real part in the 'choice' between good and evil? And is his part the only one necessary?

a. In answer to the first of these questions, it may be said emphatically that Jesus did teach that man has a part in the choice between good and evil. This idea has been tacitly assumed throughout the chapter, and there is no reason to call it in question here. The evidence for it is plentiful. It is assumed in all the blessings on those who do good (Matt.5:3-11, 11:6, 16:17, 24:46, Lk.6:20-22, 7:23, 12:37,38,43); in all cases of condemnation for evil (Matt.5:19, 11:21, 18:7, 23:13,16, 26:24, Mk.14:21, Lk.6:24-26, 10:13, 11:42,44,46,47,52, 17:1, 22:22); in the fact that Jesus thought it worth while to teach and preach; in every call to repent; and in every

promise. Indeed there is no evidence that Jesus did not believe that man has a part in every choice.

b. As to the second question, that is, is man's part in the choice between good and evil the only one necessary? Jesus gives a negative answer. He recognizes that the pressure on a man to choose evil may be so great that he cannot, by his own power, make a right choice. He has a part to play in the choice, and is responsible for his own part, but that part is not sufficient in itself. The best evidence for this is in the story of the rich young man whose desire to follow Jesus was thwarted by his love for his possessions. Jesus recognized the extreme difficulty of making a right choice under such circumstances, and says: "It is easier for a camel to go through a needles eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." In reply to the question of the disciples: 'Who then can be saved?' He says that "with men it is impossible" (Mk.10:23-27, Matt.19:21-26, Lk.18:24-27). But although Jesus says that under some circumstances it is impossible for men, yet in the same verse He shows the way out of the difficulty. It is not impossible with God, "for all things are possible with God."

(2). This brings us to the last point in our study,

for if man needs God's help in order to choose good, his responsibility for any sinful act will depend on the presence or absence of this help. The only question that remains then is whether or not God always helps the man who desires it. Here again there can be little doubt about the answer of Jesus. He taught that the loving Father, Who desires His children to be perfect even as He is perfect, is ready to give them all the help that they are able to receive. Wendt says: "It was absolutely "far from His thought that God could withhold His assisting power from any, since this thought did not correspond with his view of God as the Father who was characterized by spontaneous love."¹ This meaning is included in His words, "Ask, and it shall be given unto you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened" (Matt.7:7-8, Lk.11:9-10). It is clear then that, inasmuch as God's help is always available, when a man knows the difference between right and wrong, he does have the power to choose the right; consequently the responsibility for a wrong choice rests entirely on him.

1. H.H. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol.II, p.79.

Summary:

The results of our study of moral freedom in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus are as follows: Jesus did not believe, as the Pelagians later did, that a man is free to choose between right and wrong "in each moment" and in equal manner." The Augustinian contention that a man is free to act only in accord with his own nature, although nearer to the teaching of Jesus, does not do it justice. In harmony with the Pelagian view, Jesus taught that man does have some choice between right and wrong; in harmony with Augustine, He contended that this choice is limited both by the things in a man's environment that appeal to his inner nature and by that nature itself, whether corrupt or redeemed. Because of these limitations, Jesus held that, although man has a part in the choice between right and wrong, he is not able by his own power to choose the right. Through the help that is always given by God, however, man is able to choose the right when it is known to him; consequently he and he alone is responsible for any wrong choice. Thus, when sin is defined as the choice of anything less than the highest known good, man is entirely responsible for sin.

HUMAN NATURE AND SINFULNESSI. Introduction.

(a). The importance of the problem of sin for Jesus' conception of man as a religious being.

(b). Our study is not concerned with the larger problem of evil.

(c). There is no abstract discussion of sin in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus.

(d). The roots of Jesus' conception of sin are found in the Old Testament.

II. The Origin of Sin.

(a). The Synoptic teaching of Jesus has nothing to say on the subject.

(b). The existence of three theories in Jesus' day makes it impossible to tell which, if any, He accepted. These theories were (1) the Fall story, (2) the lustful angels, and (3) the Yēçer Hārà.

III. The Prevalence of Sin.

(a). Sin is universal.

(b). All are not equally sinful. There are degrees of sinfulness.

IV. The Nature of Sin.

Dogmatic theology recognizes two kinds of sinfulness, namely, sins of condition and sins of the will.

(A). Sins of Condition.

HUMAN NATURE AND SINFULNESS

(a). According to dogmatic theology, sins of condition may result either from the Fall or from sins of the will.

(b). Jesus does not recognize inherited sinfulness, although He teaches that the flesh is weak.

(c). With reference to the question whether man's nature may be corrupted by sin, Jesus teaches that human nature may be corrupted. Whether or not this condition is to be called sin is a matter of terminology.

(B). Sins of the Will.

(a). The sins of the will are the only sins in the strictest sense of the word.

(b). The word "will" is used in the psychological sense of "the self in action."

(c). The kinds of acts recognized as sinful.

- (1) All acts contrary to the will of God.
- (2) When the word 'selfish' is used to suggest loyalty to one's self in contrast to loyalty to God, all selfish acts are sinful.
- (3) All choices of a lesser good. God's will is recognized as the highest good, and any failure to choose it is sinful even if the thing chosen is good in itself.
- (4) When the law is identified with the will of God, all infractions of the law are sinful.
- (5) Carnal acts are not necessarily sinful, but the flesh is a prolific source of sin.
- (6) All unsocial acts are sinful, but sin is a larger term than unsociability.
- (7) Ignorance is an evil but not a sin unless produced by shutting one's eyes to the truth.
- (8) Unbelief is recognized as a sin, but less emphasis is placed on the idea in the Synoptics than in the Fourth Gospel.

V. The Types of Sin.

HUMAN NATURE AND SINFULNESS

Sins may be either individual or collective.

(A). Individual sins.

(a). Sins of commission.

(b). Sins of omission.

(B). Collective sins. There is no trace of the primitive idea of 'corporate responsibility' in the teaching of Jesus, but He recognizes that groups may sin collectively. Collective sins are punished individually.

VI. Sources of Temptation.

The sources of temptation are both external and internal.

(A). External Sources of Temptation.

The external sources of temptation are: Satan, one's fellow men, and impersonal things that seem more desirable than obedience to the will of God. These sources have been considered in our study of the limitations of moral freedom

(B). Internal Sources of Temptation.

(a). The weakness of the flesh.

(b). Acquired depravity. Natural weakness is accentuated by evil practice, and bad character is formed.

VII. The Effects of Sin.

Importance of the study of the effects of sin.

(A). The Effects on Man's Relationship with God.

(a). Grieves and offends God.

(b). Brings about an estrangement between man and God.

HUMAN NATURE AND SINFULNESS

(c). Makes man guilty in God's sight.

(B). The Effects on Man's Relationship with His Fellow Men.

(a). The sins of men tempt others to sin.

(b). Sin is a source of discord and hostility between men.

(C). The Effects of Sin on the Sinner Himself.

(a). Temporal effects.

(1) Physical.

a. Sin causes disease.

b. All sickness and suffering are not caused by sin.

c. The final result of sin may be death, although death is not always attributed to sin.

(2) Moral and Spiritual.

a. Sin makes a man a slave of Satan or of his own lower self.

b. It sets up a conflict within a man's inner life.

c. The immediate causes of this conflict are temptation and a consciousness of guilt.

d. It produces spiritual blindness.

(b). The effects of sin that are to be experienced in the future life.

(1) Physical.

a. The necessary symbolism in discussions of the future.

b. Evidence of Jesus' belief in eternal punishment.

(2) Moral and Spiritual.

a. Loss of eternal life.

b. Unhappiness.

HUMAN NATURE AND SINFULNESS

(D). Man is not corrupted beyond recovery. He is lost, but not damned.

(E). Summary of the Effects of Sin.

VIII. The Requirements of Salvation from Sin.

(A). The requirements of salvation are partially pre-determined by the conception of man's nature and of the effects of sin. Discussion of the idea.

Summary of Chapter.

CHAPTER IV

HUMAN NATURE AND SINFULNESSI. Introduction.

(a). The problem of sin lies at the heart of any study of Jesus' conception of man as a religious being. The ultimate aim of all true religion is to bring man into harmony with the universe in which he lives. When the universe is given a personal interpretation, as it is in Christianity, the goal of religion is to lead man into fellowship and communion with God, to establish relations of love and good will between man and man, and to give him peace and harmony in his own soul. Jesus always assumed that the great barrier to the attainment of this goal is sin. When a man finds himself out of harmony with God

and man, and disturbed and troubled in his inner life, it is not because "the time is out of joint", or the world is up-side down, but his own moral life is wrong. Because of this fact, it was inevitable that sin should have a very important place in Jesus' conception of man. It is true that He placed a greater emphasis on the 'saveableness' of man than on his sinfulness, but the assumption that man is capable of being saved involves the thought that there is something from which he needs to be saved. Thus the conception of salvation is unintelligible apart from the idea of sin.

(b). It should be observed that the larger problem of evil does not concern us here. It would be interesting to study Jesus' interpretation of calamities and disasters, and the Synoptic records have something to say on the point, but these things lie outside the purpose of the present study. Our interest is limited to Jesus' teaching about sin or moral evil in man.

(c). In accord with His general practice, Jesus never discusses the abstract problem of sin. He assumes that men are sinners, and speaks of specific sins, but He does not objectify sin itself. It is a fact of common observation and experience that makes itself known through its many

manifestations, and, for Him, that is sufficient.

(d). The relation between Jesus' conception of sin and the Old Testament doctrine cannot be considered at any length, but it may be pointed out that in this matter as in the other problems which have been discussed, the roots of Jesus' ideas run back to the Old Testament. This is what we should expect. A man's conception of sin is largely determined by his idea of God and His relation to man. We have seen that the general features of Jesus' views about God are similar to those of the Old Testament. He accepted the highest development of the Old Testament idea, and ennobled it and purified it by emphasizing its best elements. In the same way He borrowed from the Old Testament its most essential ideas about sin - its universality, its individuality, its offense against God, its disastrous effects, and its punishment. These ideas undergo a course of development in the Old Testament, but after the prophetic period and particularly after the exile they are all elements of the generally accepted doctrine.

II. The Origin of Sin.

(a). There is nothing in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus

that throws any light on the problem of the origin of sin. As has been said, Jesus recognizes the fact of sin, but does not concern Himself with the speculative problem of how it came to be present.

(b). It might be argued that, inasmuch as He accepted the general truth of the creation stories, He must have looked to them for an explanation of the origin of sin. Such an assumption, however, takes too much for granted. As N.P. Williams has said: "The Paradise story of Genesis "iii contains no idea of 'Original Sin'; it is therefore "not the historical source of the Fall doctrine, which "originated in the thought of post-exilic Judaism as a re- "sult of reflection on the empirical universality of "actual sin. This observed fact suggests the presence of "some inherent taint in human nature: the Jew's intense "conviction of the Creator's goodness forbade the supposi- "tion that such a taint could have belonged to human na- "ture as originally created: it thus seemed necessary to "postulate a 'Fall' or first sin. The necessity of a "Fall having been thus arrived at by a priori reasoning, "search was made in the Biblical narratives for some event "which could be identified with the first sin; this was "found, at first, in the story of the lustful angels nar-

rated in Genesis vi.¹ Williams goes on to show that at the time in which Jesus lived, instead of one universally accepted theory of the origin of evil, there were three theories. In popular thought there was the story of (1) Adam and Eve's first sin, and (2) the account of the lustful angels mentioned above, and (3) in Rabbinical Judaism, there was the theory of the yēçer hā-rà or 'evil imagination'. The contents of these theories need not concern us here, but it is evident that, if there were three theories in the field at the time Jesus lived, His general acceptance of the teaching of the Old Testament would not have committed Him to any of the three. If then Jesus held opinions concerning the origin of sin, it is impossible to determine what those opinions were.

III. The Prevalence of Sin.

(a). Jesus teaches that sin is universal. He does not say as much in the Synoptics, but there can be no doubt but that it is assumed throughout. The evidence is both positive and negative. The negative evidence is seen in the fact that on no occasion did He assume that any men other than Himself are sinless. It is true that He some-

1. N.P. Williams, 'The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin', Synopsis, p.xi-xii.

times speaks of men as 'righteous' (Matt.9:13, 10:41, Mk.2:17), but, where the word is not used ironically, it denotes a comparative righteousness and not sinlessness. On all occasions He seems to think of the best as well as the worst of men as sinners. They are not equally sinful, of course, but none are recognized as entirely good. The positive evidence is revealed in the fact that Jesus calls those who were regarded as the best of men 'evil'. He pronounces woes on the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt.23:16, Lk.11:42,44,46,47,52); He calls His own disciples evil (Matt.7:11); and He rebukes them for specific sins (Mk.8:33). If Jesus believed that the best of men are sinners, He must have thought that sin is universal. Further evidence for the universality of sin is involved in His calling upon all men to repent (Mk.1:15, 6:12, Matt.4:17, 11:20, Lk.13:3,5), and teaching men to say, "Forgive us our sins... and bring us not into temptation" (Lk.11:4). When these various kinds of evidence are considered, no room is left for the doubt that He believed sin to be universal.

(b). Although Jesus recognizes that all men are sinners, yet He does not believe that all, or even any, are as bad as they can be. This idea was considered in our discuss-

ion of moral freedom, and it was pointed out that Jesus did not believe man to be totally depraved. According to Augustine's doctrine of total depravity, mankind, by the Fall, became powerless to do good, and only by the grace of God could this power be restored. Jesus recognizes the need of God's grace, and yet, instead of teaching that man is utterly devoid of power to do good, He found a spark of good in the worst of men. He comes nearest the idea of total depravity when He speaks of those who have blasphemed against the Holy Ghost (Matt.12:32, Mk.3:29, Lk.12:10); such blasphemy indicates that they have lost the power of distinguishing between good and evil. At the other extreme, He speaks of those who correspond to the good tree which "cannot bring forth evil fruit" (Matt. 7:18). It is probable that Jesus does not believe that the power of an opposite choice is completely lost in either of these cases; He recognizes them as opposite poles, and between these extremes are to be found men in all degrees of character and goodness. The degree of badness and goodness is not a racial but an individual matter. Men may not be "far from the kingdom of God", or, as we have seen, they may be near the border line of hopelessness.

IV. The Nature of Sin.

In dogmatic theology, the nature of sin is the most important aspect of the whole problem. The Augustinian theology insisted that sin is of two kinds - (1) sins of condition and (2) sins of the will. We shall consider these types separately.

(A). Sins of Condition.

(a). Dogmatic theology teaches that sins of condition may come into existence in two ways - by the Fall or as a result of sins of the will. By the Fall, human nature itself became sinful. This sinful nature was transmitted by Adam through the ordinary process of generation to all his descendants; consequently all men are sinful from birth, not because they have actually committed sin, but because they have inherited a sinful nature. This evil nature of man is so truly sinful that it carries with it real guilt, for all mankind had a part in the sin of Adam as the seminal head of the race.

We have seen that the idea of total depravity had no part in the teaching of Jesus, but that the moral freedom of man is limited by certain elements in his nature. Are these elements really sinful? Does Jesus believe that man has inherited a partially sinful nature?

And, if man's inherited nature is not sinful, may it become so as a result of wilful sin?

(b). First then does Jesus believe that man's inherited nature is sinful?

No convincing answer can be given to the question, but there are several points in His teaching that would seem to indicate a negative conclusion. These points have to do chiefly with His attitude toward children. If all men inherit a sinful nature, the little child would be sinful. Inasmuch as Jesus did not teach total depravity, we need not say that the child would be as sinful as the adult, but the difference is one of degree only. Instead of discoursing on the sinfulness of children, however, Jesus looked upon their simple trustfulness as a model for the conduct of their elders. He said, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein," and "Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God" (Mk.10:14-15, Matt.19:14, 18:3, Lk.18:16-17). If the members of the kingdom are child-like, it is highly improbable that Jesus regarded the nature of the child as sinful. The same thing is indicated by His blessing of children. Mark says, "And he took them in his arms, and

"blessed them, laying his hands upon them" (Mk.10:16).

This action is more significant when it is contrasted with the woes which He pronounced upon the scribes and Pharisees for their wilful sinning, and upon the sinful cities which had refused to hearken unto His message (Lk. 11:42-44, Matt.11:21, Lk.10:13).

Against this evidence may be placed the verses about earthly parents being evil and yet able to give good gifts unto their children (Matt.7:11), and the sayings concerning corrupt trees which cannot bring forth good fruit (Matt.5:17,18). These passages, however, do not say whether men are born evil or become so by their own acts; consequently their value is little. The idea of inherited guilt may seem to be implied in Matthew 23:35, "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar." (See also Luke 11:51). It must be remembered, however, that those upon whom this penalty is pronounced are not innocent men. Jesus makes it clear that they have deserved the punishment due their forefathers, not because they are descended from them, but because they have committed similar sins (Matt.23:29-33).

We are justified then in concluding that man does not inherit a nature that is actually sinful. This does not mean that his nature may not be weak, or even possess tendencies toward sinful action; it means that there is no actual sinfulness with its attending guilt. The sins of the fathers may be visited on the children leaving their natures greatly weakened, or, according to our evolutionary theories of to-day, men may have inherited instincts which, when given unbridled expression, result in sin, but no sin or guilt is there until men have yielded to these weaknesses.

This position is supported further by the fact that the Jews always regarded matter as good. Tennant says: "The doctrine of an inherited corruption comes "dangerously near to resolving original sin into physical¹ "evil." Having been educated to think that God had made all things "very good", it is unlikely that Jesus believed man to be born with a corrupt nature.

(c). But may man's nature become sinful as a result of wilful sin? Two problems are involved in this question: Can the nature of man be corrupted by sin? And should this corruption be called sin?

1. F.R. Tennant, 'The Origin and Propagation of Sin', p.38.

As was suggested in the preceding chapter, there is no room to doubt that Jesus believed that a man's nature may be corrupted by sin. This is plainly stated in Mark 7:20-23: "And he said, That which proceedeth out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness; All these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man." The expression "defile the man" means that his character may become corrupt. Various other expressions in the gospels indicate Jesus' belief that men may have corrupt characters. He speaks of men being 'evil' (Matt.7:11); of the 'corrupt tree' which cannot bring forth good fruit (Matt.7:18); of men having 'hard hearts' (Matt.19:8); of the 'evil treasure' of the heart (Matt.12:35); and of the inner character of men being like 'whited sepulchers' (Matt.23:27). These verses prove that Jesus believed a man's character may become corrupt and depraved as a result of sin. Whether this condition, produced by sin and becoming in turn the source of sin, is to be called a sinful condition or not is a matter of terminology. The truth is that Jesus recognizes

in man that type of moral corruption that later dogmatic theology designated as 'sins of condition'. Whether such terms are properly used, need not concern us here.

(B). Sins of the Will.

(a). In the second of the general classes of sin - in a strict sense, the only class that can rightly be called sin - are the sins of the will. As pointed out in the preceding chapter, Jesus believed sin to be essentially a choice of something less than the highest known good. Although it is uncertain whether corruption of character should be called sin, Jesus recognized that there must be wrong choices somewhere along the line, or sin was not involved. The proof that Jesus believed sin to be essentially an act of will is seen in the fact that nearly all the particular sins which He mentions are of such character. The point will be made clearer as our study proceeds.

(b). The word 'will' is not used here in the narrow sense of one of the three functions of the mind, but in the broader sense of the function of the whole self - the self in action.¹ In this sense an act of will may include all three mental functions. Thus Jesus speaks of "evil thoughts..., fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries,"

1. J.A. Hadfield, 'Psychology and Morals', p.69.

"covetings, wickednesses, deceit, etc." This list of sins shows that He recognized that all the functions of the mind were involved in sin.

(c). Having agreed then that, for Jesus, sin was essentially an act of will, we have to determine what kind of acts He believed to be sinful. What theory did He hold regarding what constitutes sin?

(1). In the first place, it is clear that He believed all actions contrary to the will of God to be sinful. If the word 'law' be taken to mean the same as 'will', the Westminster Catechism correctly interprets Jesus when it states that "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God."

a. The evidence for this fact is found in the following sayings: "Not every that sayeth unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt.7:21). "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matt.12:50, Mk.3:35). These sayings make it clear that Jesus believed all actions contrary to the will of God to be sinful. The same thing is implied in the sayings in which He teaches that men need God's forgiveness for their sins. The need

of forgiveness implies an offense against God, and an offense is something contrary to the will of another. Thus Jesus teaches men to pray, "And forgive us our debts, "as we also have forgiven our debtors" (Matt.6:12); and He says "forgive, if ye have aught against any one; that "your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your "trespasses" (Mk.11:25). Further evidence for the same fact may be seen in Matt.6:14,15 and Lk.23:34. If other proof is needed it may be found in the idea that God punishes men for sin. This point will be considered later, but it is obvious that God could punish men only for that which is contrary to His will.

b. The importance of the idea that sin is an act contrary to the will of God is very great. It gives every sin a personal reference; it is not merely the breaking of an arbitrary rule, but it is a personal offense. In the light of the teaching that God is love, instead of being an infraction of a fixed standard of conduct, it is any failure to live a life of perfect love. We shall see that nearly all the other conceptions of sin are included in this.

(2). Another all-inclusive conception that might be justified by the teaching of Jesus is that sin is selfish-

ness. This idea is closely related to the preceding one, for man's refusal to obey God is always a concession to his own selfish desires. The difference between the two, however, is seen in the fact that, whereas it is always sinful to disobey God, acting in accord with one's own will is only sinful when the thing willed is out of harmony with God. This is indicated in specific cases by the following facts: (1) Jesus' use of money for His own purposes although He condemned those who allowed it to be more important in their estimation than service to God (Matt. 17:27, 19:23-24, Mk.10:24-25); and (2) His ^{commendation (?)} condemnation of family life although, at the same time, He condemns those who allow loyalty to family to exceed loyalty to God (Mk. 10:7, Matt.10:35,37, 19:5, Lk.14:26). Other evidence might be given, but it is unnecessary; for, if man has freedom of choice, and the ultimate standard of right is the will of God, to choose anything contrary to God's will is selfishness. At the same time it is evident that acting in accord with one's own desires is only sinful when those desires are in conflict with the will of God.

(3). Again, the teaching of Jesus offers some grounds for maintaining that sin is the choice of a lesser good. It is this fact that makes temptation to sin possible. Sin

would have no attractions if it offered something that was wholly bad in place of something that was entirely good. Jesus realized this fact, and He taught that the best things in this life are often the greatest menace to man's supreme loyalty to God. The chief dangers to the spiritual life are not shocking crimes and the viler forms of sin, but riches, a greater love for one's family than for God, and placing a higher value on the physical life than on the spiritual (Matt.10:36, 16:25, 19:24, Mk.8:35, Lk.17:33). This point is brought out clearly in the record of Jesus' own temptation. The story undoubtedly comes from Jesus Himself, any may thus be used to throw light on His conception of sin. Whatever the deeper significance may be, the meaning on the surface is very significant. According to Matthew's account, in the first temptation He represents Satan as tempting Him to disobey God in order to satisfy the needs of His own body; in the second His child-like trust in God is to be given up for an experimental test; and in the third His loyalty to God is challenged by an offer of "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them" if He will fall down and worship Satan (Matt.4:3-10, Lk.4:3-12). In each of these cases, the strength of the temptation depends on the attractiveness of the thing offered in place of obedience to God.

In other words, Jesus recognizes that sin is never a deliberate choice of evil for its own sake, but the choice of a lower as compared to the highest good; for He always regarded God's will as the highest good.

(4). Another theory that has some support in the teaching of Jesus is that sin is the breaking of the law. This was the accepted theory of Judaism. God's law had been given to Moses, and it was the final standard of righteousness. The Jews, however, had not been content with this law alone. It was difficult to know how to apply it in specific instances; consequently, the great teachers of the nation had sought to interpret its application to the details of life. In Jesus' day a large body of traditional interpretations with a sanctity equal to the law itself were recognized. Having received a Jewish training, Jesus accepted the general principle of the theory. Sin was indeed the breaking of the law of God, but He differed from His contemporaries by insisting that God's law must be identified with His will. The Mosaic law and its interpretations could be called the law of God only in so far as they were in harmony with the conception of Father love (Matt.19:8). Thus we find that, although Jesus insisted that His followers must fulfil every jot and tittle of the

law, yet He Himself did things that the Jews felt to be infractions of it (Matt.5:18, 12:10-13, Mk.2:23-28).

Such results were inevitable when different conceptions of the law were involved. Jesus believed sin to be disobedience to the law, but the law which He had in mind was the eternal law that had its source in the holy will of God.

(5). A fifth theory regarding the nature of sin is that sin is carnality. It is assumed that inasmuch as many specific sins have their origin in the instincts and desires of the flesh, all sin may properly be described as 'fleshly'. It will be pointed out in the sequel that the weakness of the flesh is one of the sources of temptation to sin, but to say that Jesus believed all sin to be carnality is to give the word a broader meaning than is justifiable. It is true that modern psychology has sought the motives of all human action in the instincts of man, but if, as we have sought to prove, Jesus did not admit complete psychological determination, it is wrong to claim support for this theory in His teaching. As was pointed out in the preceding chapter, Jesus believed that, by God's help, man has the power to choose right rather than wrong in spite of the limitations of the flesh. If this be true, the flesh may be the source of all temptation, but it is not the

cause of sin. It is temptation that is to be identified with carnality, and not sin.

It is equally false to say that Jesus believed any carnal act to be sinful in itself. Later, dogmatic theology sometimes regarded 'concupiscentia' (the sexual act) as a sin under all circumstances.¹ Jesus condemned adultery, but showed His disapproval of this theory by His attitude toward marriage (Matt.5:27, Mk.10:6-9, Matt.19:4-6).

(6). Another theory which helps us to understand Jesus' conception of sin is the idea that sin is the doing of any unsocial act. That is, sin is an act that is in some way detrimental to the interests of our fellow men. There is much in the teaching of Jesus that would lend support to this conception. Most of the things that He specifically condemns as wrong belong to this class. If it be argued that the ultimate test of righteousness is the will of God, it may be answered that, inasmuch as God loves man, any act beneficial to him is in harmony with the will of God, and any act harmful to him is contrary to God's will. The weakness of this theory is that it assumes God's love for

1. See H.W. Robinson, 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', pp.187,189,190,206,208,211.

man to be such that He regards man as the highest end in the universe. Certainly there is no support for such an idea in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus. He recognizes God's Fatherly love for man, and consequently He holds that most unsocial acts are sinful; but He does not teach that man's importance is so great that his welfare is the ultimate test of right and wrong. On the contrary, He assumes that a man may sin against God, the Holy Spirit, or even against himself, as well as against his fellow men (Lk.15:18,21, 18:9-14, Mk.3:29, Lk.12:10). Thus it is clear that, although Jesus believed most unsocial acts to be sinful, yet He did not think that the all-inclusive sin was unsociability,

(7). The theory that sin is ignorance finds little support in the teaching of Jesus. Tennant says: "There is "no case in which He can, without question, be considered to "call, or which compels us to infer that He would call, by "the name 'sin' any deviation from the objective right or "good, in which the agent was, through no moral fault of his "own, ignorant that he was contravening the law of God."¹

The teaching of Jesus assumes that ignorance of the things of God is an evil, but there is no indication that He

1. F.R. Tennant, 'The Concept of Sin', p.29.

thought that men were responsible for that evil before they had a chance to learn. Indeed, it is highly probable that in His own childhood He ignorantly did things the social effect of which would not be good. It would be unnecessarily destructive to our faith in His sinlessness to assume that such acts were sinful.

The attitude of Jesus toward the scribes and Pharisees might seem a contradiction of this idea. He undoubtedly believed that they were guilty of sinning when they did things which they did not recognize as wrong. The real cause of their sin, however, lay deeper than their ignorance; they were spiritually blind. They had as much knowledge concerning the religious teaching of the Old Testament as Jesus and His followers, but they had allowed their moral sense to become so perverted that they were not able to distinguish between right and wrong. Their sinfulness and guilt were due, not to the fact that they had done wrong ignorantly, but to the fact that they had shut their eyes to spiritual truth, and thus had produced their own ignorance. It was a part of their moral perversion or corruption of character, that is, it was more a result of sin than a sin in itself. The acts of such moral perverts are an exception to the idea that sin is a choice of something

less than the highest known good, but, even in their case, the corruption of their character is the result of such choices in the past. They are blamable, not because they have done wrong ignorantly, but because their own acts have produced the moral perversion which made such ignorance possible.

(8). Finally, the Fourth Gospel pictures Jesus as teaching that the all-inclusive sin is unbelief. The importance of the idea to the mind of the Evangelist is indicated by the fact that he speaks of it eighty times in twenty-one chapters. The conception is found in the Synoptics, but it does not have as much importance as in John. In the questionable phrases at the end of the sixteenth chapter of Mark, Jesus says: "He that believeth and is "baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be "condemned" (Mk.16:16). Jesus begins His ministry with the exhortation to repent and believe the Gospel (Mk.1:15). The increased emphasis on unbelief in the Fourth Gospel over that of the Synoptics is due to the greater importance given the person of Christ in the work of salvation. As will be shown later, the elements of a Christology are found in the Synoptics, but they are not so fully developed as in John. When the significance of the work of Christ is being em-

phasized, it is natural that the heinousness of a failure to believe on Him should seem greater; consequently, although unbelief is recognized as a sin in the Synoptics, its importance is not so great as in John.

V. The Types of Sin.

Although the great emphasis of the teaching of Jesus was on the individual, and consequently, He spoke more frequently of this type of sin than of any other, yet He recognized that sins may be either individual or collective.

(A). The individual sins are of two kinds - sins of commission and sins of omission. When the will of God is recognized as the standard of human conduct, men may sin either by doing things contrary to God's will or by the failure to do the things which God desires of His children.

(a). Most of the specific sins of which Jesus spoke were sins of commission. All of the sins listed as proceeding from the heart in Mk.7:21-22 are of this class. He does not use the term 'commission', but He teaches that every thought, feeling, or act contrary to the will of God is a sin.

(b). In the same way, He teaches that any failure to act according to the will of God is sinful. In the story

of the good Samaritan, the priest and the Levite did nothing evil, but Jesus implies that they were blameworthy because they failed to act the part of a neighbor (Lk.10:30-38). Likewise in the judgment scene of Matthew 25, Jesus says that the Son of man will say unto those on his left hand "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these "least, ye did it not unto me" (Matt.25:31-46). Failure to do acts of kindness to the sick, the hungry, the thirsty, or the lonely brought condemnation as truly as active sins would have done.

(B). As indicated above, Jesus recognized that groups as well as individuals might be responsible for sin. It is doubtful whether there is any trace of the primitive idea of 'corporate responsibility' (that is, group responsibility for the acts of an individual who is a member of the group) in the Synoptics, although Matthew 23:35 is a close approach to this idea. Jesus did recognize, however, that groups may sin collectively. The proof of this is seen in His condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees for the sins of their group (Lk.11:42,44); His denunciation of the lawyers (Lk.11:46); His woes on the cities in which most of His mighty works had been done (Lk.10:13-16, Matt.11:20-24); and His weeping for Jerusalem because it had stoned and

killed the prophets (Matt.23:37).

Although Jesus makes it clear that the members of a group are responsible for the sins of their group, it is doubtful whether He anticipated that they would be punished collectively. In the case of some of the cities mentioned, the punishment seems to have fallen on them as cities, but when Jesus condemns scribes, Pharisees, and lawyers, it is probable that He means that they will be punished individually for their part in the sins of the group to which they belong.

VI. Sources of Temptation.

Most of the important facts with reference to Jesus' ideas of temptation have been suggested in our discussion of 'Moral Freedom and Responsibility for Sin'; consequently only the briefest survey will be necessary here.

The temptations which Jesus recognized fall naturally into two classes - external and internal. Inasmuch as temptations are limitations of moral freedom, it may be assumed that they are never strictly external. It is only as external things appeal to the inner nature, and thus become transformed into internal temptations that they are able to tempt at all. When this point has been recognized, however, we may proceed to consider those things in the ex-

ternal world which are capable of such a transformation.

(A). External Sources of Temptation.

The external temptations fall naturally into three classes - Satan, the evil influence of one's fellow men, and impersonal things that may seem more desirable than obedience to the will of God.

The power of Satan to tempt man has already been considered.

Jesus recognizes that men may tempt one another to sin. This is expressly stated in Mark 12:15, when the Pharisees and Herodians ^{ask} Him if it is lawful to pay tribute unto Caesar, He answers, "Why tempt ye me?" The same idea is assumed in Matthew 18:6, Lk. 17:2: "But whoso shall cause one of these little ones which believe on me to stumble, it is profitable for him that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depth of the sea."

The third source of external temptation has also had sufficient discussion in the consideration of the limitations of moral freedom. The power of money, property, influence, or loyalty to one's family or state, to test one's loyalty to God was pointed out. The insidious character of such temptations is recognized by the frequency

with which Jesus alludes to them.

(B). Internal Sources of Temptation.

(a). The power of a man's inner nature to tempt him to sin has also received some consideration in the preceding chapter. The 'New Psychology' lays great emphasis on the idea that most of the actions that theology calls sin are the natural expression of the instincts of man. Jesus, of course, knew nothing of the New Psychology, but its fundamental thesis was presupposed in His teaching. This is His meaning when He speaks of the Spirit being willing but the flesh weak. He recognizes that hunger, thirst, sex desire, the craving for the approval of others, and most of the other natural impulses of men are sources of temptation to evil. Thus the temptation to commit adultery arises out of man's sex instinct (Matt.5:27-28); the temptation to be hypocritical out of a man's desire to have the approval of his fellows (Matt.6:1-6); and the temptation to covet out of the acquisitive instinct (Mk.7:22, Lk.12:15). All these temptations are included in the weakness of the flesh.

Again it should be pointed out that in the idea that the 'flesh is weak' there is no suggestion of actual corruption or of necessary evil. The lower nature of man offers the most favorable point of attack for the demonic

powers.

(b). The influence of bad character in tempting men to evil has also received sufficient consideration. Matthew 7:18 shows that Jesus believed that when a man has developed a bad character he cannot, without God's help, do anything but evil. The natural weakness of the flesh may be accentuated by evil practice until the will loses its power of resistance.

VII. The Effects of Sin.

The study of the effects of sin is of greatest importance for an understanding of Jesus' conception of man as a religious being. He conceived His own mission in the world to be that of saving men. We shall see that His idea of salvation was largely determined by His conception of the evils from which man needs to be saved. Most of these evils were the direct effect of sin. He believed these effects to be of three types: (1) the effect on man's relationship with God, (2) on his relationship with his fellow men, and (3) the effect upon himself.

(A). The Effects on Man's Relationship with God.

(a). In the first place, Jesus teaches that sin grieves the heart of God. This idea is not expressed, but it is

clearly implied. In Luke 15:7, He says: "There shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons, which need no repentance." It may be assumed that the heavenly joy is shared by the Father, and if God rejoices over repentance, He must have been grieved at the sin that made repentance necessary. The anxious searching for the lost coin and the lost sheep imply the same idea. In the story of the prodigal son, the enthusiastic welcome that the father gave his boy when he returned home is an indication of the greatness of the burden that the waywardness of his son must have laid upon his heart. The prodigal himself confesses that he has "sinned against heaven, and in thy sight" (Lk.15:21). The assumption, which Jesus shared with His contemporaries, that God is the one who must forgive sins, points in the same direction (Matt.6:12,14,15, Mk.11:25,26, Lk.5:20-24, 7:47-49, 23:34). It is true that Jesus Himself claimed this power, but He claimed it only in His capacity as the representative of God (Matt.9:6, Mk.2:10, Lk.5:24). If God alone can forgive, the offense of sin must be against God.

(b). Again, Jesus teaches that sin brings about an estrangement between man and God. The ideal fellowship is

broken, and the blessed communion between Father and son is not realized.

This idea is suggested by the use of the word 'lost' (ἀπολωλώς). A thing lost is separated from its owner; it has strayed from its accustomed place. So Jesus speaks of coming "to seek and to save that which was "lost" (Lk.19:10, Matt.18:11); of being sent "unto the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt.15:24); and of the lost coin (Lk.15:8-9), the lost sheep (Lk.15:4,6), and the lost son (Lk.15:32). The journey of the prodigal into a "far country" implies the same thing (Lk.15:13). The sinner is separated from God, and no real happiness is possible until the Divine fellowship is renewed.

It should be noted that Jesus assumes that fellowship with God is the normal state. The sheep wanders from the fold; the coin is lost from the purse; and the son goes into a far country. All three are out of the place in which they belong. This point gives further support to our conclusion about Jesus' teaching on original sin.

(c). The third effect of sin on man's relationship with God is to make him guilty in God's sight. Such guilt should not be confused with a man's own consciousness of guilt. This consciousness will be considered when we study

the effect of sin on the man himself. But Jesus recognized that sin makes a man guilty in the eyes of God. This is indicated by His teaching on forgiveness. We have seen that forgiveness implies an offense against God, but it also implies that man is guilty in God's sight for an offense would not need forgiveness if guilt were not involved. Jesus believed sin to be universal; consequently He taught that all men were guilty before God, and that all should pray for forgiveness as regularly as they asked for their daily bread (Matt.6:12).

(B). The Effects of Sin on Man's Relationship with His Fellow Men.

The effects which Jesus recognized that sin produces in the relations of men may be grouped in two classes: (1) sin tends to lead others into sin, and (2) it causes discords and hostility between man and man.

(a). First, Jesus teaches that the sins of men tend to tempt others to sin. Sin is contagious, and a man needs to be on his guard constantly in order to protect himself from it. This is the meaning of His words in Luke 12:1, "Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy." The same idea is involved in causing "one of these little ones that believe on me to stumble" (Matt.18:

6), and in His warning to beware of false prophets that come in sheep's clothing (Matt.7:15). Many other passages of a similar character might be cited. Jesus seems to think of sin, as He thinks of His message, as being able to work unseen in the hearts of men, but producing a different effect, namely, corruption and spiritual decay.

(b). Jesus likewise recognizes sin as a source of discord and hostility between men. He emphasizes chiefly the effect of sin on the sinner himself, but recognizes that it may have disastrous effects upon man's relations with his fellows. This is implied in the emphasis that He gives to the idea of forgiving the offenses of others. He teaches that God's forgiveness of the sins of men is contingent upon their forgiveness of those who trespass against them (Matt. 6:14,15, Mk.11:25, Lk.11:4 etc.). In the same manner He teaches that a trespass should be forgiven "seventy times seven" (Matt.18:22). The idea undoubtedly is that offenses cause discord and ill will, and that a willingness to forgive will reduce both to a minimum. The idea is implied also as the opposite of the golden rule. When Jesus teaches that ideal conditions would be established among men if only they would do unto others as they would have others do unto them, He suggests that strife and discord is

caused by a failure to act in accord with this rule. In other words, that sin is the cause of all unkindness and unfriendliness. More direct proof of the point is difficult to find in the Synoptics, but the evidence is cumulative, and when the teaching of Jesus is considered as a whole there is no reason to doubt that He believed sin to be the cause of all unfriendliness and hostility between man and man.

(C). The Effects of Sin on the Sinner Himself.

Although, as we have seen, Jesus has much to say regarding the effect of sin on God and one's fellow men, yet the emphasis of His teaching is on its effects on the sinner himself. These effects are of two kinds - those which apply to the present life, and those which will be experienced in the world to come.

(a). The temporal effects of sin on the man himself may be divided into two classes: (1) physical, and (2) moral and spiritual. We shall consider these two classes separately.

(1). Physical.

a. In the first place Jesus recognizes that sin may cause disease. He does not teach that all disease is caused by sin, but He suggests that at least some of it is.

Perhaps the plainest illustration of this point is in Mk.2:3-12 with its parallels in Matt.9:2-8 and Lk.5:18-26. Jesus says to the man "sick of the palsy": "thy sins are forgiven". Plummer says that the man "probably believed, and perhaps knew, that his malady was the direct consequence of his own sin."¹ But whether the man knew it or not, the words of Jesus can have no other meaning. The same idea may be suggested by the woman with "a spirit of infirmity" ... "whom Satan had bound, lo, these eighteen years" (Lk.13:16). The reference is not quite so plain here, but it seems probable that Jesus believed that Satan gained his power over the woman through her sin.

b. It was a popular idea at the time of Christ, as it had been for many centuries (See Job), that all sickness and suffering were caused by sin. Inasmuch as there was no doctrine of a future life in the Old Testament, Israel believed that God would give long life and prosperity to all who obeyed His commandments (Ex.20:12, Deut.5:16), and the complementary doctrine naturally was that He would send affliction and suffering on those that disobeyed them. Although, as we have seen, Jesus believed that sin sometimes causes disease, yet He repudiated this more extreme doctrine.

1. Plummer, 'Int. Crit. Commentary', St. Luke, p.154.

trine. Luke 13:1-5 is as follows: "Now there were some
"present at that very season which told him of the Gali-
"laeans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacri-
"fices. And he answered and said unto them, Think ye that
"these Galilaeans were sinners above all the Galilaeans,
"because they have suffered these things? I tell you,
"nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall in like manner per-
"ish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower of Siloam
"fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders
"above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you,
"nay: but except you repent, ye shall all likewise perish."
These verses make it clear that, although Jesus believed
that sin might cause disease and suffering, He did not be-
lieve that they were always caused by it.

c. The idea that physical death is caused by sin
does not appear in the Synoptics. It is probable that
Jesus observed that disease caused by sin sometimes results
in death, but the verses quoted above prove that He be-
lieved that death might have other causes.

(2). Moral and Spiritual.

a. In the first place Jesus teaches that sin may
make a man's will the slave either of Satan or of his own
lower self. This idea has been considered in our dis-

cussion of the limitations of moral freedom; consequently it needs only to be recognized here. Such verses as Matthew 7:18 and Lk.13:16 show that Jesus believed that sin may gain such complete control of a man that his power to choose good, without God's help, is lost.

b. Again, Jesus teaches that sin may set up a conflict in a man's inner life. This conflict may be of two kinds - that caused by temptation and that which results from a consciousness of guilt. The first of these conflicts has already received some consideration. No argument is needed to show the discord in a man's heart when he is torn between a loyalty to God on the one hand, and to his property, his family, his state, or even his own life on the other. The experience of Jesus Himself in His wilderness temptation is that of one whose soul is troubled by opposing desires.

Jesus also makes it plain that a man's inner life may be greatly disturbed by a consciousness of guilt. He does not believe that all sinners have such a consciousness. On the contrary, as has been pointed out, one of His deepest regrets was that men, who should have recognized their sin, felt themselves good, and even offered themselves, blind though they were, as leaders of those that confessed

themselves blind (Matt.7:3-5, Lk.6:39, etc.). But, although all men do not have a consciousness of their guilt, yet some of them do, and when this consciousness is present, Jesus makes it clear that it may produce unhappiness or even mental distraction. The best example of this is the publican in the temple. He is so conscious of guilt before God that he is in despair. The contrast in his mind between the holiness of God and his own moral degradation is such that he "would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote his breast, saying, God, be merciful to me a sinner" (Lk. 18:13). Jesus does not look on this anguish of heart, distressing as it was to the man himself, as altogether evil. It is much to be preferred to the complacency and self righteousness of the Pharisee who, shutting his eyes to his obvious imperfections, thanked God that he was not as other men (Lk.18:11).

c. The third of the moral effects of sin is spiritual blindness. The great majority of sinful men are neither the abject slaves of sin nor harassed by the consciousness of an overwhelming guilt. They are more to be compared to the Pharisee who believed himself good. They have compromised with sin while persuading themselves that they were righteous; consequently sin has so blinded their hearts

that they have lost the power to distinguish between good and evil. As was suggested, Jesus believed that the scribes and Pharisees, as a class, were sinners of this type. Modern writers, particularly those of Jewish blood or faith, sometimes take pains to show that the scribes and Pharisees were not so bad as the gospels would seem to suggest; they were really very respectable men. Jesus was not ignorant of this fact, but He believed that conventional respectability is a greater menace to righteousness than more open sin. The publicans and the viler types of sinners knew that they were sinners; consequently, they felt a need of salvation from their sin. The scribes and Pharisees were not guilty of the vilest sins, but they had 'rationalized'¹ themselves into believing that their more respectable sins were not sins at all. Thus sin had produced moral blindness (Matt.15:12-14, 23:16.17,19, Lk.6:39).

(b). The effects of sin that are to be experienced in the future life, like those of the present life, are of two types - that is, (1) physical, and (2) moral and spiritual.

(1). The Physical Effect that Sin in this Life Produces in the Life to Come.

a. All discussions of the future life are necessarily

1. The word 'rationalized' is used in the psychological sense.

symbolical. As Dr. L.P. Jack's suggests in a quotation from Goethe, "The highest cannot be spoken"¹; consequently we do not expect even Jesus to tell us in detail about the wonders of the future, and when He does speak of them, we expect to find His language symbolical. This is certainly true in the Synoptics.

b. Allowing then for symbolism, it may be said that Jesus seems to teach that physical punishment awaits the unforgiven sinner in the life to come. Preparation is made for this idea in His acceptance of the doctrine of a physical resurrection. As we have seen, He believed that human nature is a unity and that a future life in a complete sense is impossible without a body. But if man is to continue to be a unity of physical and spiritual elements in the future life, there is no reason why he may not be subject to physical punishment. The proof of this is shown by the following sayings: "Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell (Gehenna) of fire" (Matt. 5:22); "It is good for thee to enter into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire" (Mk. 9:43); "But the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness; there shall -----
1. L.P. Jacks, 'The Living Universe', p.22.

"be the weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt.8:12). Among numerous other references are Matthew 5:29, 7:13, 10:15,28, 11:22,24, 18:8-9, 23:33, Lk.10:12,14, 12:5, 16:23, and 17:26-27. These references indicate that Jesus believes that sinners will receive physical punishment for their sin in the future life. Since the language is symbolical the details should not be pressed, and even the general conclusion is not beyond doubt because of the possibility that Jesus may have spoken of moral and spiritual punishment in physical terms. Nevertheless, in view of His conception of human nature, it is probable that He believed the punishment would be really physical.

(2). The Moral and Spiritual Effects which Sin in this Life Produces in the Life to Come.

The Synoptics show us that Jesus believed that men are punished in the future for sins committed in this life, not only physically, but also morally and spiritually. This moral and spiritual punishment is of two types - negative and positive.

a. First, Jesus makes it clear that the negative punishment of sin in the future world will be the loss of 'eternal life'. It will be shown that when man is considered as a religious being, the ultimate and all-inclusive

goal of the future is this eternal life. It is the 'summum bonum' of religious living. Sin endangers the attainment of this goal. The idea of eternal life is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, but it is found in the Synoptics also. In the judgment scene of Matthew 25, Jesus says of those who have been condemned, "And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life" (Matt.25:46). In Mark 10:17-22 with its parallels in Matthew 19:16-22 and Luke 18:18-23, a rich man asks Jesus what he must do to inherit eternal life. Jesus replies by telling him to keep the commandments. It is implied that any failure to keep them will result in the loss of the goal that is sought. Lk.10:25-37 may be a different version of the incident, but its teaching on this point is the same: sin will result in a failure to attain eternal life.

b. On the positive side, Jesus teaches that sins committed in this world will produce great unhappiness and dissatisfaction in the world to come. This idea is pre-supposed in the other points that have been considered. If sin results both in a failure to attain the goal of life and in physical punishment, unhappiness is inevitable. Thus Jesus speaks of sinners receiving judgment (Matt.23:14,

Mk.12:40, Lk.20:47), of the danger of eternal judgment (Mk.3:29), of being cast into "outer darkness" where there is "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt.8:12), and of the "unquenchable" fire of hell (Mk.9:43). In the story of the rich man and Lazarus, He pictures the rich man as "being in torments" in Hades (Lk.16:23). As was suggested, these details ought not to be interpreted too literally, but they undoubtedly refer to the sorrow, remorse, disappointment and suffering which result from a consciousness of guilt, a failure to attain the highest goal of life, separation from God and His love, and, possibly, physical suffering.

(D). Negatively, Jesus did not teach that sin corrupts a man beyond recovery. As Prof. Bruce suggests, he was never called 'damned' or 'worthless', but simply 'lost'. The word lost suggests the idea that the one who is lost is capable of being found. "Sympathy and hope were expressed "in the very terms which Jesus employed to describe the "moral degeneracy of those whose good He sought." ¹ Because this was true, there is an unlimited possibility of salvation in His conception of man. Others might look upon sinful men as hopeless - damned. Jesus regarded them only

1. A.B. Bruce, 'The Kingdom of God', pp.136-137.

as 'lost'.

(E). Summary of the Effects of Sin.

We have seen that the effects of sin may be divided into three groups: it affects man's relationship with God by grieving the heart of God, causing a separation between man and God, and making man guilty in God's sight; it changes the relation between man and man by inducing sin in others and by setting up discord and hostility; finally, it affects the life of the sinner himself both in this world and in the world which is to come. The effect of sin in this world is twofold - (1) physical, and (2) moral and spiritual. Its physical effect is to produce disease, and, in some cases, death; although Jesus believed that neither disease nor death are always caused by sin. Its moral effect is to enslave man to Satan and to his own lower self, to cause discord and lack of harmony in his inner life, and to make him blind to spiritual distinctions. The effect of sin in this world on the experience of men in the world to come is also twofold: its physical effect is eternal punishment; its moral and spiritual effect is permanent separation from God, failure to attain eternal life, and extreme dissatisfaction and unhappiness.

VIII. The Requirements of Salvation from Sin.

(A). It is the contention of this thesis that in any study of man as a religious being, the idea of salvation is partially predetermined by the conception of the condition from which men are to be saved. If this be true, Jesus' conception of the effects of sin will determine, to a great extent, His idea of salvation. That it is not the only factor, may be admitted. If man had not sinned, his condition in this world, at least, would not be ideal. Jesus recognizes the existence of evils other than sin, and man may need to be saved from these. Even if all the evils that afflict man are taken into consideration, we cannot forecast the details of salvation, for there may be more than one way of saving men from evil. Nevertheless, it will be shown that the general character of salvation is predetermined by the evils from which man is to be saved, and there can be no doubt that Jesus believed the greatest of these evils to be sin. If sin offends God, destroys His fellowship with man, and makes man guilty in God's sight, salvation must bring about reconciliation, fellowship, and forgiveness, if sin leads others into sin or creates hostility and ill will between man and man, salvation must bring to an end the evil influence of one man on another and create conditions of harmony and good will;

if sin has undesirable effects on man both in this world and the next, salvation must remove these effects and make man the best that he is capable of being in body, mind, and spirit. The succeeding chapters will show that Jesus' conception of salvation fulfilled all these conditions, and also those laid upon it by the natural limitations under which a man lives in the present world.

Summary:

In this chapter, we have sought to ascertain the outstanding features of Jesus' conception of the sinfulness of man. We have found that His ideas of sin, like those of psychology and freedom, are grounded in the Old Testament. He teaches no theory of the origin of sin, and gives no indication as to which, if any, of the prevailing theories is most acceptable to Him. He holds sin to be universal, but He does not believe that all men are equally sinful and guilty. There is no idea of total depravity in His teaching, and no recognition of original sin, although He does recognize that man's nature is weak and may even possess tendencies that will lead to sin. He teaches that man's nature may be corrupted by sin, but does not answer the question as to whether this corruption should be called

sin. He believed sin to be essentially an act of will, but such acts are sinful only when they are out of harmony with the will of God. Other conceptions of sin that throw light on the teaching of Jesus and are in some measure justified by it are: sin is selfishness; it is the choice of a lesser as compared to the highest good - the will of God; it is disobedience to the law; it is carnality; it is the committing of unsocial acts; and it is unbelief. The idea that sin is ignorance finds no support in the teaching of Jesus, although He recognizes that the man whose character has been corrupted by sin, may sin without realizing it. As to the kinds of sin, Jesus teaches that men may sin either by omission or by commission, and that both individuals and groups may be guilty of either of these types of sin. The sources of temptation are both internal and external. The external sources are Satan, one's fellow men, and impersonal external things that seem more desirable than the will of God. The internal sources are the natural weakness of human nature, and the influence of bad character. Jesus' conception of the effects of sin was reviewed above, and there is no need to repeat it. Finally, it has been pointed out that Jesus' conception of sin and its effects is, to some extent, a guide to the ideas

of salvation that will be studied in the succeeding chapters.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SALVATIONI. Introduction.

(a). Statement of problems involved: Do all men have the opportunity to be saved? Can man be saved by desiring it? that is, can a man save himself? Has man any part in his own salvation? Does God force salvation on men? Does God give salvation to all men who do their part? and does God permit all men to do their part?

II. The Responsibility of Man for His Own Salvation.

(a). All men do not have an opportunity to be saved. Evidence from the treatment which is to be given the men of Tyre and Sidon on the Day of Judgment.

(b). The problem of man's responsibility for salvation involves the answer to two questions: Does man have a part in his own salvation? And, is his part the only one?

- (1) Man has something to do in order to be saved.
- (2) Man's part is not the only one. God gives salvation. The chief responsibility for salvation rests on God, although man is chiefly responsible for any failure to attain it.

III. The Responsibility of God for the Salvation of Men.

(A). The chief problems involved: Does God ever force salvation on men? Does He give it to all who do their part in receiving it? Does He permit all men to do their part?

(B). God does not force salvation on men.

(C). He never refuses it to any who do their part in receiving it.

(D). Does God permit all men to do their part? This is the most difficult of all because it involves the problem of election. The consideration of Jesus' attitude toward the Gentiles reserved for separate treatment in the next chapter.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SALVATIONThe Doctrine of Election.

(a). Dr. Strong's definition of election. Discussion of this definition in the light of our study. Lack of harmony between the doctrine of election and the conception of the Fatherhood of God.

(b). Synoptic Evidence Which Might be Interpreted as Showing that Jesus Taught a "Predestinarian Limitation of Acceptance to the Elect."

- (1) The use of the word 'elect' is inconclusive.
- (2) Discussion of the meaning of Mark 4:11-12.
The natural interpretation favors the extreme doctrine of election. The inconsistency between this idea and the rest of the teaching of Jesus. The attempts of various scholars to explain these verses - Stevens, Beyschlag, Montefiore. Conclusion: Inasmuch as the passage is of questionable authenticity and out of harmony with the larger part of the teaching of Jesus, it should not be given much weight.

Summary and Conclusion.

Jesus does not teach the extreme doctrine of election.

CHAPTER V

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SALVATIONI. Introduction.

In our study of Jesus' conception of man as a religious being, we have considered His ideas about the natural man and the natural man corrupted by sin. The next step in the regular order of unfolding His teaching is to examine what He has to say on the great question of salvation - how man is to be saved from the imperfections of his present life and the disastrous effects of sin.

It was indicated in the preceding chapter that we expect to show that Jesus' ideas of salvation are predetermined to a great extent by His conception of the conditions from which man is to be saved. It is the further

contention of this thesis that Jesus presented His view of salvation in the form of teaching about the kingdom of God. The complete realization of membership in the kingdom is practically identical with being saved.

Before proceeding to the examination of the details of this idea, however, several preliminary problems must be considered: the present chapter will seek an answer to the question who is responsible for saving man; the next one will inquire whether Gentiles are to share in the salvation of the kingdom on the same terms as Jews; and the chapter following that will deal with the much disputed problem of the time when the kingdom of God is to come.

The problem of responsibility for salvation naturally divides itself into a study of the relative parts of God and man in salvation. It involves such questions as the following: Do all men have the opportunity to be saved? Can men be saved by desiring it? that is, can a man save himself? Has man any part in his own salvation? Does God force salvation on men? Does God give salvation to all men who do their part? and Does God permit all men to do their part?

II. The Responsibility of Man for His Own Salvation.

First then, we shall consider the questions that deal with man's responsibility for his own salvation: Do all men have an opportunity to be saved? and, if an opportunity is granted, does man have a contribution to make to his own salvation? And, is his contribution the only one?

(a). Jesus teaches that all men do not have an opportunity to be saved; at least, all men do not have such an opportunity in this world. This idea comes to us with a shock, for we find it hard to reconcile it with the conception of the Father love of God. Jesus does not admit of any inconsistency between the two ideas, however, and makes no attempt to reconcile them. Man's lack of opportunity is merely another evil to be added to those considered in the preceding chapter. They are inscrutable to the minds of men, and yet we can trust that there is a good reason for them in the omniscient purpose of God, and, inasmuch as He loves us as a Father, that they result in ultimate good.

The clearest evidence on this point is in Matthew 11:21-24 and Luke 10:12-15. In these verses, Jesus pronounces woes on the cities in which most of His "mighty

"works were done", because they have not repented. He says that, if Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom had had such opportunities, they would have repented long ago "in sackcloth and ashes"; consequently it will be more tolerable for them in the day of judgment than for cities with greater opportunity. These sayings make it clear that all men do not share equally in the opportunity to be saved. When this is true, the responsibility for salvation is not entirely on them because they have not had a chance. It is probable that Jesus recognized that they were under some responsibility because of the natural light of conscience. This seems to be implied when He speaks of it being "more tolerable" for Tyre and Sidon in the Day of Judgment. It is clear, however, that He does not believe that they have had sufficient opportunity for salvation to enable them to be saved.

(b). But supposing men to have the opportunity of being saved in the sense of having heard the Gospel and having the meaning of salvation presented to them, are they responsible for accepting it? This question really involves two others. Does man have a contribution to make to his own salvation? And, if so, is it the only contribution necessary? The question of God's part in the acceptance of salvation will

be considered when we study the responsibility of God.

(1). Jesus' answer to the question whether man has a contribution to make to his own salvation is an emphatic, Yes. Throughout the Synoptics He assumes that man has a part to play in his own salvation, and that he is entirely responsible for that part. The evidence for this fact is so abundant that it scarcely needs to be stated. The teaching of Jesus assumes it; His commendation of those who do well, and His condemnation of those who do evil take it for granted; it underlies all the 'whosoever' sayings; and it is assumed in every appeal, and tacitly understood in every command that deals with questions of duty. In fact, if man had no part to play in his own salvation, and no responsibility for that part, the life and teaching of Jesus would be unintelligible.

(2). It has been shown that, if salvation is presented to a man, he has a part in accepting it. But does he play the whole part? Is salvation something that man can appropriate? Can he earn it by fulfilling all the conditions required, and thus save himself. The problem of man's part in salvation will be discussed more fully in our chapter on 'Receiving the Salvation of the Kingdom'. It must be pointed out here, however, that, although Jesus al-

ways held man responsible for his own part in salvation, yet He did not teach that that part was the only one. It will be shown that repentance and faith are, in part, gifts of God; consequently, salvation is also a gift. Men do not earn the right to it; God bestows it upon them. They have something to do with receiving the gift, but not with earning it.

The strongest proof of this fact is in the parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Matt.20:1-16). In this parable Jesus teaches that the factor which determines the rewards to be given men is not their individual merit, but the gracious love of God. God not only has a part in salvation, but His part is the principal one. This is true to such an extent that Jesus speaks of it being the "Father's" "good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Lk.12:32). The chief responsibility rests upon Him.

It should be observed that it is the responsibility of attaining salvation that rests upon God, and not the responsibility for a failure to attain it; for however great God's responsibility may be, if He does His part, the complete responsibility for any failure rests upon man.

III. The Responsibility of God for the Salvation of Men.

(A). In considering the responsibility of God for bestow-

ing salvation on man, the chief problems are as follows:

(1) Does God ever force salvation on men? (2) Does He give it to all who do their part in receiving it? (3) Does He permit all men to do their part? It will be seen that the third of these questions is the most difficult, for it involves the problem of Jesus' attitude toward the doctrine of election. Our treatment of it will be proportionate to its difficulty and importance.

(B). First, does God ever bestow salvation on those who do not desire it? Does He save men against their will? There is no conflict in the testimony of the Synoptics as to Jesus' answer to this question. He always makes it clear that salvation is optional. Men may accept it or refuse it, but their acceptance is never compulsory; there are no slaves in the kingdom of God.

The positive proof of this truth is seen in the frequent appeals to the will of man: He is asked to repent and believe (Mk.1:15), to love (Matt.5:44), to serve (Mk.10:44), to do God's will (Mk.3:35), in short, to fulfil all the conditions of salvation. Such appeals would be unnecessary if God did not need the consent of man before bestowing salvation upon him. The point is proved negatively by the fact that Jesus mourns over those who fail to

accept salvation. His woes on the cities in which His work has been done (Matt.11:21, Lk.10:13), and His weeping over Jerusalem (Matt.23:37) are inexplicable if we suppose that God can save any whom He chooses, and that man cannot resist such a choice.

(C). With reference to the question whether God bestows salvation on all who do their part in receiving it, the answer of Jesus is equally clear. He held that, if man will fulfil the conditions of salvation, the gift will be his. Perhaps the most direct statement to this effect is in Mark 16:16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." As it is thought that the original ending of Mark is lost, this passage is somewhat doubtful, but it may be authentic teaching of Jesus. There are many other passages, however, which support the idea: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you; For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened" (Matt.7:7-8, Lk.11:9-10); "Not every one that sayeth unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt.7:21); and "If thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments" (Matt.19:17). In

the passage that will be studied in detail in the consideration of the next question (Mk.4:11-12), Jesus is quoted as saying that if men hear the Gospel and are converted, even if such conversion be contrary to God's purpose, their sins will be forgiven them. In other words, these strange verses seem to imply that, even if men are converted contrary to God's will (if such an idea were thinkable), God would be obliged to save them. It will be shown that the authenticity of these verses is questionable, but there can be no doubt that Jesus held that God would bestow salvation on all who fulfilled the requirements.

(D). As was suggested, the third question mentioned above is the most difficult of all. We have seen that Jesus believed that God bestows salvation on all men who fulfil the conditions, but does He permit all men to fulfil these conditions? Are some elected to salvation, and others, not?

The attitude of Jesus toward the Gentiles is naturally a phase of the problem raised here; but, inasmuch as this matter has been the subject of considerable debate, and is even regarded as a live question to-day by that school of thinkers which emphasizes the Jewish element in the character of Jesus, it will be reserved for a separate and more detailed consideration in the next chapter.

If the conclusions reached in the present discussion are a forecast of the results of this later chapter, the only apology necessary is that it is unavoidable because of the unity in the teaching of Jesus.

(a). The Doctrine of Election.

Before taking up in detail the teaching of Jesus on our present problem, it is well to get clearly in mind the meaning of the doctrine of election. Perhaps as good a definition as any, for our purposes, is that of Dr. A.H. Strong in his 'Systematic Theology': "Election is that eternal act of God, by which, in His sovereign pleasure, and on account of no foreseen merit in them, He chooses certain out of the number of sinful men to be recipients of the special grace of His Spirit, and so to be made voluntary partakers of Christ's salvation."¹

It will be seen that most of the points in this definition are in harmony with the results of our study. The statement that election is an act of God harmonizes with our conclusion that God bestows salvation on men; the idea that election is not based on merit, agrees with our conclusion that men cannot earn salvation; and the contention that those elected are "voluntary partakers of Christ's salvation" is also in harmony with the results reached by our -----
1. A.H. Strong, 'Systematic Theology', p.779.

own study. The statement concerning which questions must be raised is that "He chooses certain out of the number of "sinful men to be the recipients of the special grace of "His Spirit." In other words, this doctrine says that God chooses certain men to be saved, not because they are more worthy than others, for all are equally unworthy, but because of "His sovereign pleasure", and for the same reason He does not choose others. It is difficult to reconcile this idea with the perfect Father-love of God. The doctrine seems unjust, and represents God as arbitrary and partial in His dealings with men. It helps very little to argue, as Dr. Strong does, that "Election deals... with "sinful, guilty, and condemned creatures;" and that "We "may better praise God that He saves any than charge Him "with injustice because He saves so few;" or that "It represents God, not as arbitrary, but as exercising the free "choice of a wise and sovereign will, in ways and for reasons that are inscrutable to us." To all this one cannot refrain from replying that, although these things may be true, they are not in harmony with the conception of Fatherhood that one gets from reading of a God who "maketh his "sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on -----
1. A.H. Strong, 'Systematic Theology', pp.785-787.

"the just and the unjust" (Matt.5:45).

It is clear then that, in the light of the study of the teaching of Jesus that has been made up to this point, there is a lack of harmony between the conception of election which has just been presented and Jesus' conception of the Fatherhood of God. If it can be established that He held this idea of election, we must either modify our conclusions regarding God's Fatherhood or hold that He was inconsistent in His attitude toward the question. Schweitzer takes this latter view when he says, "The ethical idea of salvation and the predestinarian limitation of acceptance to the elect are constantly in conflict in the mind of Jesus."¹

(b). Synoptic Evidence Which Might be Interpreted as Showing that Jesus Taught a "Predestinarian Limitation of Acceptance to the Elect."

(1). It may be argued that Jesus uses the word 'elect' (ἐκλεκτός) several times in His teaching, and the conclusion may be drawn that He means the same thing by it that a modern theologian would mean in using it to-day. It is true that Jesus uses the word four times in the Synoptics (seven if parallels are counted, Mk.13:20,22,27, Matt.24:22,24,31, Lk.18:7), but it is just as possible that when

1. Albert Schweitzer, 'The Quest of the Historical Jesus', p.353.

He uses it He means those who have fulfilled the conditions of salvation and are therefore accepted by God, as that He refers to men chosen to be the "recipients of the special grace of His Spirit." Matthew 20:16 and Luke 12:32 are equally uncertain in their meaning.

(2). The only passage in the Synoptic Gospels that seems to give support to the conception of election outlined above is Mark 4:11-12 and its modified parallels in Matthew and Luke (Matt.13:10-15, Lk.8:9-10). The Markan verses are as follows: "And he said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables: That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them." The natural interpretation which these words suggest is not favorable to the conception of the universal love of God. If Jesus purposely taught in an obscure form in order that some men might not understand Him, and if His attitude correctly represents the mind of God, it would be necessary to conclude that the doctrine of election is right in asserting that "in His sovereign pleasure... He chooses certain out of the number of sinful men to be the recipients of the special

"grace of His Spirit." These verses go even further than the doctrine of election, for they picture Jesus as concealing the truth in order to prevent men from being converted and having their sins forgiven.

Such ideas are so full of discord to those familiar with the teaching of Jesus that they cannot go unchallenged. It is difficult to believe that He, who is reported as saying: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation" (Mk.16:15), could also utter the words under discussion with the meaning they naturally suggest. Many scholars have shared in this feeling, and have sought to give these verses an explanation that would harmonize with the rest of the teaching of Jesus. Professor G.B. Stevens explains the passage as a "free rendering of Is.6:9-10, which is a picture of the increased obduracy produced by the representation of truth to those who have no mind to receive it.... Truth can but blind the mind that refuses and despises it. That Jesus did not mean to say that His parables were directly intended to blind the minds of men to spiritual truth is evident, both from their nature and effect."¹ Professor Willibald Bey-schlag says: "To the disciples it was given to know the -----"
 1. G.B. Stevens, 'The Theology of the New Testament', p.121.

"mysteries of the kingdom of God because they had sufficient susceptibility and spiritual sense to enquire about the meaning of the parables. To the people it was denied because this spiritual mind and enquiry were wanting."¹

Both of these explanations are very suggestive. Professor Stevens' statement that the passage is a "free rendering of Is.6:9-10" is confirmed both by a study of the verses mentioned and by the Matthaean account of the incident which states that the disciples asked Jesus why He spoke to them in parables. If Mark is the source of Matthew, it is evident that the latter felt that the two verses needed explanation. He observed that they were taken from Isaiah, and proceeded to give Jesus the credit for using them (Matt.13:14). The fact that the various accounts of this incident, in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, differ so widely is evidence enough in itself that we ought not to take the passage too seriously.

It is difficult to determine what Jesus did say, but it may be regarded as a certainty that these verses misrepresent Him. It is possible that the request for an explanation of the simple parable reminded Him of the lines in Isaiah, and that He quoted them either jokingly or half

1. Willibald Beyschlag, 'New Testament Theology', Vol.I, p.140.

vexed at the disciples' stupidity. Everyone knows from his own experience how some trifling incident of every day life will remind him of a line from Shakespeare or one of the poets, and it would provoke him greatly to have his quotation taken seriously.

Mr. C.G. Montefiore suggests that these verses are out of harmony with the rest of the passage, particularly verse twenty-one, and consequently it is reasonable to suppose that they are a later interpolation.¹ This theory is worthy of consideration, but, if Mark is the source of Matthew and Luke, it is necessary to suppose that this interpolation took place between the time Mark was written and the composition of the other two gospels. The relative shortness of this period makes the theory more doubtful than it would otherwise be. But whatever be the exact truth, it is clear that these verses are out of harmony with the teaching of Jesus, and there is too much doubt about their authenticity to permit us to regard them as proving that Jesus taught the doctrine of election.

It is necessary then to conclude that the supposed inconsistency in the teaching of Jesus does not exist. God is always the perfect Father, and, although He has a

1. C.G. Montefiore, 'The Synoptic Gospels', Vol.I, pp.121-123.

part in the salvation of man, yet He either does His part impartially for all men or, in the case of those that are not given an opportunity - as the men of Tyre and Sidon, He does not hold them responsible for their failure. The opportunity that they might expect for such a God is not denied them, but merely delayed until the Day of Judgment.

Summary:

Our study of the relative responsibility of God and man in the work of salvation has led to the following conclusions: All men do not have an opportunity for salvation in this life; when such an opportunity is given, men have a contribution to make to their own salvation; this contribution, however, is not sufficient in itself, that is, man cannot earn salvation or attain it by his own power; God has a part to play in the process, and His part is the principal one; He is chiefly responsible for man's attaining salvation, but not for any failure to attain it; He does not force salvation on men; He always bestows it on those who fulfil the conditions required; and He never makes it impossible for men to desire to fulfil the conditions.

THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION FOR GENTILESI. Introduction.

- (a). Statement of the problem.
- (b). Definition of 'particularism' and 'universalism'.
- (c). History of the conditions which caused the problem to arise.
 - (1) The early Hebrew conception of God and His relation to the nation.
 - (2) The development of monotheism and the failure of the Israelites to bring their attitude toward the Gentiles into harmony with it.
 - (3) The inconsistency between monotheism and particularism.
 - (4) The reason for the failure of Israel to eradicate this inconsistency is found in the nation's loyalty to her sacred literature. Particularism was embodied in that literature.
 - (5) Evidence for the above facts.
 - (6) Reasons for the Gentile interest in the Jewish religion. Its monotheism, its high ethical standard, and its doctrine of a glorious future life.
 - (7) The recognition of the inconsistency of the position by the more intelligent Jews and their efforts to overcome it. Proselytism.
 - (8) Conditions in Jesus' day. The universalism of John the Baptist. The continued existence of particularism among Jewish leaders.

II. The Arguments which Tend to Show that Jesus was a Particularist.

- (a). Particularism was bound up with Jewish history, and Jesus accepted the general truth of the historical records.
- (b). Jesus identified Himself with traditional views in many other ways.

THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION FOR GENTILES

(c). Sayings of Jesus which tend to indicate that He accepted particularism.

- (1) His treatment of the Syrophenician woman.
- (2) Sayings which limit His ministry to the Jews.
- (3) His words to Zacchaeus.

(d). The difficulty of explaining the particularism of Peter in the tenth chapter of The Acts.

III. The Arguments which Tend to Show that Jesus was an Universalist.

(A). Refutation of the Particularist Arguments.

(a). Jesus was critical of the ethical positions of the Old Testament.

(b). He did not always accept tradition.

(c). The brighter side of the story of the Syrophenician woman.

(d). In the Zacchaeus incident, Jesus probably means that salvation is bestowed on Zacchaeus more readily than on a Gentile because, at that stage of His mission, He and His disciples were dealing with Jews only.

(e). The narrowness of an element in the later Church was probably due to the stupidity of the disciples in understanding their Master.

(B). Positive Arguments for Universalism.

(a). The teaching of Jesus is universalistic in its general aspects.

- (1) The salvation of Judaism was not of this character. It was centered in the temple; it required ceremonies so burdensome that the poor could not perform them; and it demanded that those who received it must either be Jews or become Jews by submitting to certain prescribed rites.

THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION FOR GENTILES

(2) Universalistic elements in the teaching of Jesus.

- a. The salvation of the kingdom of God was universalistic because, being internal and spiritual, it could not be confined in geographical and national boundaries.
- b. It was simple enough that all could understand it, and yet profound enough to appeal to the deepest things in the hearts of men.
- c. It was individual.

(b). The Indirect Evidence that Jesus was Universalistic in His Attitude Toward the Gentiles.

- (1) The 'whosoever' sayings.
- (2) Other sayings which suggest the same idea.
- (3) Other indirect evidence.

- a. Jesus' friendliness to the Samaritans.
- b. His attitude toward proselyting.
- c. His use of baptism.

- 1. Evidence that Jesus used baptism.
- 2. Discussion of the significance of the use of baptism. Baptizing Jews meant putting them on the same plane as Gentiles.

(c). The Direct Evidence for Universalism in the Teaching of Jesus. Quotation of sayings which give a proper climax to the whole argument.

Summary.

Jesus conceived salvation to be open to all peoples on the same terms.

CHAPTER VI

THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION FOR GENTILESI. Introduction.

(a). The purpose of this chapter is to answer the question whether Jesus taught that the Gentiles must become Jews in order to share in salvation. In the preceding chapter, we concluded that God is impartial in His attitude toward men, and that, when the requirements of salvation are known, all men have an equal opportunity to be saved. But was membership in the Jewish nation one of these requirements? Did Jesus teach that the salvation of Gentiles depended on their becoming Jews? It will be recalled that this problem was mentioned in our discussion of election, but its consideration was postponed until this time.

(b). Before beginning the discussion of the problem, it is well to define the meaning of two of the terms which will be used. The first is 'particularism'. By this phrase is meant the Jewish idea that their nation stood in a special relation to God as His chosen people, and that the salvation which God gave to men was only for those who were born Jews or became members of the nation by submitting to certain rites. The other term - 'universalism' - designates the attitude which is opposed to particularism. That is, universalism is the attitude of mind that recognizes all men as equal before God, and conceives the terms of salvation as being the same for all.

(c). In the beginning of our discussion, it will be necessary to give a brief survey of the facts which caused this problem to arise. At the present day, we are so accustomed to think of the terms of salvation as the same for all that it may be difficult to understand how this could be a problem for any one. Why was it that any question should be raised about the right of the Gentiles to share in the blessings of salvation on the same terms as Jews? What is the origin of Jewish particularism?

(1). The answer to these questions takes us back to the early days of the history of Israel, and makes a brief

consideration of their idea of God necessary. The Yahweh of ancient Israel was not the God of the whole world. At that time every tribe had its own god, and it was supposed that the authority of each tribal deity was limited to his tribe or the district in which his tribe lived. The god of Moab ruled over Moab, but had no jurisdiction outside the boundaries of that country; whereas the god of Edom might do very much as he pleased in Edom but had no power in other places. So Yahweh, the god of Israel, was Israel's god only. He was not the God of the whole earth, and had no authority over any people or land except his own. Under such circumstances, it was assumed as a matter of course that, inasmuch as Yahweh was Israel's god, Israel was Yahweh's people. Where ^ypolytheism prevailed, no other conception was possible. Particularism was the natural fruit of such a ^ypolytheistic philosophy, and it was as characteristic of the attitude of the other tribes toward their gods as of Israel.

(2). The monotheism of later Israel developed out of this ^ypolytheistic root. Little by little the importance and the authority of Yahweh grew in the minds of His people until they came to think of Him as the God of all the earth. We cannot enter into a discussion of the causes which

brought about the growth of monotheism, but it seems certain that this development was partly due to the pride of the people of Israel in the greatness and power of their god. They believed that He was stronger than any other, and they could not tolerate the thought that He could have a real rival. This faith in Yahweh's superiority gradually led to the belief that He was supreme in heaven and earth.

But although the idea of God developed, the conception of Israel's relationship with God did not keep pace with it. So long as Yahweh was the god of their tribe only, it was natural, as we have seen, for the Israelites to think of themselves as His chosen and peculiar people, but, when they had come to regard Him as the God of the whole earth, particularism should have been abandoned. It had become the vestigial remainder of an outworn conception of religion. As a matter of fact, however, although monotheism became firmly established, particularism remained.

(3). The inconsistency between these ideas is too self evident to require prolonged discussion. If Yahweh ~~were~~ to be regarded as the Creator and Ruler of all men, it was not logical to continue thinking of Him as the Champion of Israel. The idea was consistent so long as other nations had their own gods to look after their welfare, but when

Yahweh had come to be regarded as the only God, Israel's special claim to Him should have been released. "If
 "monotheism were true, then Judaistic particularism was
 "false, and God was the God and Saviour of the Gentiles
 "also."¹

(4). Although, as we have seen, the abandonment of particularism was demanded by the logic of monotheism, yet Israel was not able to give it up. The reason for this inability is found in her history. The nation regarded herself as a theocracy, and, in a sense which is not true, perhaps, of any other people, her history was sacred. Particularism was woven into the fabric of every record, and to abandon it was equivalent to giving up the sacred truth of history itself. In fact, particularism was the philosophy in the light of which all the facts of history had been interpreted.

(5). The evidence for these facts is so well known that there is no need to set it forth in any detail. The history of Israel begins with Yahweh's call to Abraham to leave Ur of the Chaldees and to go to the land of Canaan. The promise given him is: "I will make of thee a great
 "nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great;

 1. R.H. Charles, 'Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian'.
 p. 311.

"and be thou a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen.12:1-3). This promise was later confirmed by a covenant (Gen.15:18), but, from the moment of the promise, the descendants of Abraham regarded themselves as Yahweh's chosen people. They believed that He watched over them with the greatest interest and care; He was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; He delivered the Children of Israel out of the bondage of Egypt; He led them during their forty years of wandering in the desert, and assisted them in conquering the land of Canaan; through the period of Judges, He gave victory to the Israelites in their battles except when they sinned against Him; and He remained their champion after the kingdom was established. So long as Israel obeyed the will of Yahweh they were victorious over their enemies and the nation prospered, but when they sinned, He permitted their enemies to triumph over them in order to punish them for their sin. The historical matter of the Old Testament is almost entirely concerned with the relationship between Yahweh and His chosen people. When we add to these facts the consideration that this interpretation of history had been given a fixed and permanent form in litera-

ture, it is easy to understand why it was impossible for the Israelites to give up particularism.

(6). Turning our thought for a moment from the intellectual difficulties which the Israelites had in reconciling monotheism and particularism, let us consider the matter from the Gentile standpoint. Since the Gentile had his own gods, what reason was there for him to be interested in the Jewish religion? The answer is to be found in the inherent superiority of the religion of Israel after the development of monotheism over all other contemporary religions. This superiority was due, first, to monotheism itself. Without attempting to discuss the reasons for it, it is unquestionable that there were many among the Gentiles who recognized in the monotheism of Israel a more satisfactory conception of religion than their own polytheistic ideas could offer them. It was due, in the second place, to the ethical character of Israel's God. Men naturally desire that their gods shall be, not only wise and powerful, but also righteous, just, and merciful. These qualities in the God of Israel had a powerful appeal to the Gentiles. Finally, the superiority of the religion of Israel over those of contemporary nations was due to the fact that, in the later stages of her history, she combined a doctrine

of a glorious future life with the other virtues of her faith. This idea was not absent from the Gentile religions, but Israel alone united all three conceptions in one. Because of this inherent superiority, Judaism might have hoped to become an universal religion had it not been for its particularism. The only blot on the character of Yahweh was His supposed attitude of favoritism to Israel.

(7). As was suggested above, the more intelligent Israelites felt the inconsistency between monotheism and particularism, and this feeling would be accentuated, no doubt, when the number of contacts with the Gentiles was increased. Something had to be done to harmonize the two ideas. To give up particularism was impossible; some other method must be found. But, if the idea of the covenant relation between Yahweh and Israel were to be maintained, only one method remained open. Some means must be devised of admitting Gentiles into the covenant relationship. Such a solution would not be completely satisfactory to those who had caught the true significance of monotheism, but, with the idea of particularism so thoroughly entangled in their history and literature, no other plan would seem possible. Proselyting represents the Jewish attempt to harmonize monotheism and particularism. By becoming Jews,

the Gentiles would share in the blessings which an impartial monotheism would naturally have given them.

(8). But what conditions with reference to this matter existed in the day in which Jesus lived?

The gospels make it clear that before Jesus began His ministry there was at least one man who was preaching an universalistic doctrine. John the Baptist requires repentance and baptism of Jew and Gentile alike, and he warns the Pharisees and Sadducees not to trust in their Jewish blood for God could raise up children to Abraham from the stones of the desert (Matt.3:5-9). Nevertheless, it is clear that particularism of the type we have described was the prevailing conception of the day. Even the warning of John assumes that the Jewish leaders held this view, and there is a great deal in the Gospels which confirms the idea. This evidence includes: the central place which was given to the temple worship; the strict observance of all the sacred feasts and fasts that had their origin in the particularism of Jewish history (Lk.2:40); and the animosity toward Samaritans (Lk.9:53). These and many other things make it clear that, in spite of monotheism, even as late as the time in which Jesus lived, the majority of the Jewish people believed that any Jew might be saved

if he kept the law, but that no Gentile could enjoy salvation without becoming a Jew. The idea that all men were equal before God was not unknown, but the prevailing view was that the Jew had a special advantage above all others.

II. The Arguments which Tend to Show that Jesus was a Particularist.

What attitude did Jesus take toward this great question? Did He share the particularistic attitude of the Jews, and believe that monotheism and particularism could be harmonized by allowing the Gentiles to become Jews? What evidence do the Synoptics offer for the solution of these problems?

(a). In the first place, it may be argued that particularism was bound up with Jewish history and Jesus accepted Scriptural history as authentic. We have seen that it was the relation of particularism to their history and literature that prevented other intelligent Jews from abandoning it. Did Jesus take the same attitude?

Forgetting for the moment what was said in the opening chapter regarding Jesus' use of the Old Testament, It may be contended that His attitude toward the Scriptures was uncritical. He believed that events of the past occurred just as they are recorded; He accepted the creation

account of Genesis (Mk.10:6, Matt.19:4), the story of Cain and Abel (Matt.23:35), and the record of the flood (Matt. 24:37-39); and He speaks of Jonah as an historical character (Matt.12:39-41), talks of the experiences of David (Matt.12:3, Mk.2:25, Lk.6:3), and interprets the prophecies concerning the return of Elijah (Mk.9:13). If Jesus believed all these things to be actual history, are we not justified in supposing that He accepted the particularistic interpretation of history which we have seen to be characteristic of much of the Old Testament?

(b). Again, it may be argued that Jesus identified Himself with the traditional position of the Jews in many other ways. He taught in their synagogues (Matt.12:9, 13:54); He kept the required feasts, and especially the passover (Matt.26:19, Mk.14:16, Lk.22:13); He worshipped in the temple (the Synoptics do not expressly say this but it can safely be assumed); and He allowed Himself to be called the Christ - a name that had no meaning outside of Judaism (Mk. 8:29). If Jesus accepted Jewish history as authentic, and identified Himself with so much of the traditional Jewish system, is it not reasonable to suppose that He accepted the fundamental Jewish conception regarding the relation of God to the nation?

(c). In addition to these two general arguments for the position, there are some sayings of Jesus which apply.

(1). First, in the experience of Jesus with the Syro-phoenician woman, He seems to show hostility to the Gentiles (Mk.7:25-30): He refuses to cast the devil out of the woman's daughter; He speaks of her people as 'dogs'; and, by calling His power to heal "the children's bread", He seems to imply that the blessings of salvation belong first to the Jews. It is true that some of the sting is taken out of the saying by the fact that He grants the request of the woman a moment later, and there must have been something in His tone and manner that encouraged her to press her claim; nevertheless, it cannot be denied that, taken at their face value, these words seem to indicate that Jesus supported the narrow particularistic views which prevailed at the time. We shall have more to say about this passage later.

(2). Second, Jesus limits His own ministry to Israel, and, during His lifetime at least, He forbids the disciples to preach to or teach the Gentiles. He Himself spent His whole life in Palestine. Had He chosen to do so, we cannot doubt but that He might have gone out to Asia Minor, Greece, Rome or any other part of the world as it was known

at that time, but He chose to concentrate the efforts of His ministry on His own nation. In addition to the general evidence which is clear to any reader of the Gospels, we have the direct statement in Matthew 15:24: "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." His commands to the disciples on this point are found in Matthew 10:5-6: "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Although there are other explanations for the fact that Jesus confined His ministry to Israel, yet it can be regarded as evidence of a bias toward particularism.

(3). Again, in one passage Jesus seems to assume that only those who are sons of Abraham are eligible for salvation. In Luke 19:9, He says: "To-day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham." Plummer interprets this to mean that "his detested calling¹ has not cancelled his birthright." But if Jesus means to say that Zacchaeus is saved because he is a Jew whereas the same faith in a Gentile would not be effective, He is manifesting the attitude of particularism.

(d). Finally, if Jesus taught that salvation is open to

1. A. Plummer, 'International Critical Commentary on St. Luke', p.437.

Gentiles on the same terms as to Jews, how are we to explain the particularism of Peter in the tenth chapter of The Acts. As one of the inner circle of the disciples of Jesus, he had plenty of opportunity to understand the mind of his Master. Why is it then that a vision is necessary before he can see that God intends the Gentiles to share in the blessings of salvation? (The Acts 10:34). Is not his lack of understanding a proof that Jesus was a particularist?

These are the chief passages and arguments which seem to support particularism in the teaching of Jesus. They are neither numerous nor conclusive, and very few scholars have been convinced by them, but they are of such importance that they cannot be ignored in a consideration of the problem.

III. The Arguments which Tend to Show that Jesus was a Universalist.

A great deal more may be said in favor of the argument that Jesus taught that the blessings of salvation were open to Jew and Gentile alike.

(A). Refutation of the Particularist Arguments.

In the first place, there is something to be said against the validity of the arguments for particularism.

(a). It is true that Jesus did not enter into the critical questions of Old Testament history, but, as was pointed out in the opening chapter, it is a mistake to say that His attitude was entirely uncritical. In ethical and religious matters, He did not hesitate to differ from the traditional positions of the Jewish Rabbis, and, in His teaching on righteousness, He frequently criticized the commonly accepted interpretations of Scripture even daring at times to supplant the lower standards of the Old Testament with higher ones. His insight was chiefly in the realm of ethics and morals rather than history. The problem of who should be saved was an ethical question; consequently, the argument that He was uncritical of history would have nothing to do with His attitude toward the Gentiles.

(b). In the same way, the argument that He complied with the traditional religious requirements of the Jews and accepted many of their attitudes has little value because of the evidence that there was a great deal with which He did not comply: He is careless about ceremonial washings (Mk.7:1-15); He does not obey the strict rules of the Sabbath (Mk.2:23-28); He changes or modifies the usual interpretation of the law whenever He thinks it necessary (Matt. 5:21-48); and He does not regard the customary fasts as

binding upon Himself or His disciples (Mk.2:18-20). If, as has been shown, He does not hesitate to break with tradition when He feels that its ideas are worthless or mistaken, there is no significance in the argument that He must have been a particularist because that was the traditional Jewish position.

(c). In regard to the story of the Syrophenician woman, it has been said that, on the face of it, it is difficult to reconcile the incident with the idea that Jesus meant to include the Gentiles in His kingdom. There are, however, certain things to be noted about the event that make it doubtful whether it is proper to interpret it as an example of particularism. In the first place, although Jesus refuses to cast the devils out of the woman's daughter, yet a moment later He withdraws His refusal and grants her request. When the salvation of the kingdom of God is discussed, it will be shown that He regarded casting out devils and healing the sick as blessings of salvation. It does not follow that either the woman or her daughter actually became members of the kingdom of God or received full salvation, but it is certain that they were allowed to share in some of the blessings which accompanied it. The use of the word dogs (*Κυνάρδιον*) is difficult to explain.

The word means a tame or common household type of dog, but that does not remove the stigma which seems to be implied by it. Whatever explanation is accepted, however, it seems evident from what follows that Jesus does not place any great stress on the word, and His manner of using it does not appear to have given offense to the woman. It is possible that He meant only to test her faith, or that He wished to recall the traditional Jewish attitude in order that the contrast between it and His own conduct might be more evident. At the very worst, if Mark's version be correct, Jesus does not give the woman a complete refusal. He merely says: "Let the children first be filled" (Mk.7: 27), and the words would seem to imply that the Gentiles would share later. This is probably the correct interpretation of the incident. Jesus conceives His own mission to be the establishing of the kingdom in Israel, and He hesitates to begin healing those outside His own country. lest their response should be so great as to turn Him from His chief purpose. His hesitation is not due to any lack of sympathy with the woman, or any sharing the prejudices of His people; but to His feeling that the final triumph of the kingdom of God would be brought about more quickly if He concentrated His energies on His own nation.

(d). This idea also explains the words in Luke 19:9.

Jesus suggests that the blessings of salvation are bestowed on Zacchaeus more readily than they would have been on a Gentile because, at this stage of His mission, He and His disciples are dealing with Jews only.

(e). Even the argument from the narrowness of Peter's view in the tenth chapter of The Acts loses its force when we remember how stupid the disciples were about understanding the teaching of their Master. Some of the profoundest truths of His message did not become clear to them until after His death, and we need not be surprized that Peter needed the promptings of a vision before he realized that the Gospel was intended for Gentiles as well as Jews.

(B). Positive Arguments for Universalism.

(a). Again, the argument that Jesus opened the doors of the kingdom of God to Gentiles on the same terms as to Jews is supported by the fact that the teaching of Jesus is universalistic in its general aspects. In other words, Jesus showed that salvation was intended for all by making it of such character that all could receive it.

(1). The salvation of Judaism was not of this character; it was centered round a temple accessible only to those living near Jerusalem; it required burdensome ceremonies,

rules, and regulations which busy men could not find time to observe; and it demanded that those who received it must either be Jews or become Jews by submitting to certain prescribed rites.

(2). In contrast to Judaism, the salvation of the kingdom of God is of such character as to be available for all men.

a. In the first place, it is a salvation of the heart and has little to do with external matters except insofar as the heart influences or is influenced by the outside world. Instead of being centered around a temple, the salvation of the kingdom is entirely free from anything which would limit it to time or place: it has no pilgrimages to holy cities; it is not associated with worship in any specific locality (Jn.4:21-24); and its feasts and fasts may be observed as well in one part of the world as in another. Instead of laying on men burdensome requirements that those who work for their daily bread have no time to fulfil, it demands nothing more of a man than that his heart should be right. He must repent and believe the Gospel; he must seek to be perfect even as God is perfect; and he must put his faith into practice in such ways as come to his hands. These simple requirements are all that

is necessary for salvation, and they are just as possible for one man as another. If salvation is entirely internal and spiritual, it is difficult to confine it in geographical or national boundaries.

b. A second quality of the salvation of the kingdom that made it available for all men was its simplicity. The Gospel which Jesus preached was of such character that the ignorant and untrained could understand it. If a religion requires a great deal of knowledge or a high degree of intellectual training, it is impossible for the masses of men to accept it. An universal religion must be simple. At the same time, it may be exceedingly profound in another sense; in fact, if it is to have an universal appeal, it must be very profound in the sense of dealing with the deepest things of life, but it must deal with them in a manner which is intelligible to all. It is the fact that the teaching of Jesus is both simple and profound that gives Christianity its universal appeal; it deals with the deepest things of life in a way which the crudest fisherman or the most ignorant outcast can understand. Jesus recognizes this point when He says: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst re-

"veal them unto babes" (Matt.11:25).

g. A third quality of the salvation of the kingdom that gives it an universal appeal is its individuality. Each person is saved by his own repentance and faith. The religion of ancient Israel was national in character, and the fate of each individual was bound up with the fortunes of the nation. Israel was God's chosen people; consequently, God dealt with the nation rather than with individuals. So long as salvation is tied up with the fortunes of any particular group, it cannot have an universal appeal. The appeal of Christianity is universal because the salvation it offers is purely individual. We do not mean, of course, that Christianity is not a social religion, but rather that its salvation is of such character that it may be enjoyed by individuals far removed from the fellowship of others like themselves. By making the conditions of salvation such that an individual might fulfil them, Jesus makes it possible for Christianity to become a world wide religion.

In addition to the two groups of general arguments for universalism in the teaching of Jesus, the Synoptics also give us considerable specific evidence that points in the same direction. This evidence is of two

kinds - direct and indirect. We shall consider the two types separately beginning with the indirect.

(b). The Indirect Evidence that Jesus was Universalistic in His Attitude to the Gentiles.

In the first place, there are a large number of sayings in the gospels that seem to offer the salvation of the kingdom to the Gentiles on the same terms as to Jews.

(1). Chief among these, are the 'whosoever' sayings. Jesus uses the expression many times in the Synoptics: Those who break the law are condemned, and those who keep it are blessed (Matt.5:19); those who hear the sayings of Jesus and do them are compared to wise men (Matt.7:24); those confessing Jesus before men are to be confessed before the Father in heaven (Matt.10:32, Lk.12:8); and those denying Him before men are to be denied before the Father in heaven (Matt.10:33, Lk.12:9); those doing the will of God are the relatives of Christ (Matt.12:50, Mk.3:35, Lk.8:21); those who have, receive more (Matt.13:12, Mk.4:25, Lk.8:18); those saving life, shall lose it, and those losing life, shall save it (Matt.16:25, Mk.8:35, Lk.9:24); and those speaking a word against the Son of Man are to be forgiven (Matt.12:32, Lk.12:10). In these sayings, Jesus places the salvation of the kingdom on an ethical basis,

and says that whosoever fulfils these ethical conditions will receive the blessings of salvation. It is difficult to believe that this 'whosoever' does not include the Gentiles.

(2). In addition to these 'whosoever' sayings, there are many other passages in the gospels which seem to include the Gentiles: in Matthew 7:21, Jesus promises that "He that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; He invites all who are weary and heavy laden to come to Him for rest (Matt.11:28); He predicts that those who are now regarded as last shall be first in the future kingdom (Matt.20:16); He makes it clear that His own purpose is to seek and save that which is lost (Lk.19:10); and the parables of the lost sheep (Matt.18:12, Lk.15:4), and the lost coin (Lk.15:8), as well as that of the prodigal son emphasize the same idea (Lk.15:11-32). He says that any man may become His follower by denying himself and taking up his cross and following Him (Lk.9:23). One can scarcely doubt that the Gentiles are meant when He speaks of the elect being gathered from the four winds (Mk.13:26). If the last chapter of Mark contains authentic sayings of Jesus, the "whole creation" of Mark 16:15 must include the Gentiles. In the parable of

the king who made a marriage feast for his son, the Gentiles are suggested by those who are gathered in from the highways (Matt.22:1-14). Luke has what is probably another version of the same story, and, in the Lukan passage, the servants are sent out into the highways and hedges to compel those found there to come to the supper (Lk.14:16-24).

Beside these sayings which plainly suggest an universalistic element in the teaching of Jesus, there may be placed a few others which probably have this inference. The reference to the "sign of the prophet Jonas" who preached to the heathen in Ninevah may be such a suggestion (Matt. 12:39-41, 16:4, Lk.11:29-30). Dr. Thomas Walker thinks that in the parable of the grain of mustard seed, the phenomenal growth of the seed suggests the Gentiles, and that they are symbolized also by the birds of the heaven which lodge in the branches of the tree.¹ Dr. D.W. Forrest says: "The grounds on which He broke down the barriers within Judaism between Pharisees and sinners, between the scribes and the common people, implied the breaking down of all barriers between Judaism and what lay outside of it."²

1. Thomas Walker, 'The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age', pp.111-112.

2. D.W. Forrest, 'The Christ of History and of Experience', pp.417-18.

(3). Other Indirect Evidence.

In addition to these sayings of Jesus which may indicate that He regarded the blessings of the kingdom as open to the Gentiles on the same terms as to Jews, there are several other things in the gospels which suggest that idea.

a. First, there is His friendliness toward the Samaritans. As has been indicated, the Samaritans were Gentiles, and the Jews despised and hated them; consequently, if Jesus had shared the traditional attitude, we would expect that He also would be hostile toward them. As a matter of fact, however, His attitude is never unfriendly. It is true that the disciples were told not to preach to the Samaritans, but the reason for that has already been explained. When James and John ask Him to call down fire out of heaven to destroy a Samaritan village which will not receive them, Jesus replies that He has not come to take men's lives but to save them (Lk.9:52-56). This is a strong suggestion that the Samaritans are to share in the salvation of the kingdom. Of the ten lepers who were healed, the Samaritan was the only one who returned to give thanks, and Jesus tells him that his faith has made him whole. The words may mean physical healing only, but, as will be shown, physical healing was one of the blessings of the kingdom,

and it is reasonable to surmise that wholeness may have included the other blessings also. In the case of the man who fell among thieves, the phrase "good Samaritan" has become proverbial as a description of the one who was a real neighbor to him. It is inconceivable that Jesus would have chosen a Samaritan as the hero of one of His stories if He had shared His nation's animosity towards them.

b. Again, the attitude of Jesus toward proselyting seems to indicate a lack of sympathy with particularism. The saying which applies to this matter is found in Matthew 23:15: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! "for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and "when he is become so, ye make him twofold more a son of "hell than yourselves." It is natural to suppose that if Jesus had believed that a man must be a Jew in order to be saved. He would have felt either that a Gentile could not be saved under any circumstances, or that he must become a Jew. In the former case, He would have been more particularistic than the Jews themselves, and, in the latter, He would have favored proselyting. The saying quoted above does not prove that He opposed proselyting, but it shows that He did not believe that it was always efficacious in

saving men, and the natural conclusion is that He looked upon it with disfavor. If this interpretation be correct, we have a clear indication that He did not approve of particularism.

g. Another thing in the gospels that indicates the feeling of Jesus toward the Gentiles is His use of baptism.

1. It is difficult to prove from the Synoptics alone that the rite had any significance for Him. The only verses which directly state the idea are found in the teaching which follows the resurrection, and some scholars¹ question the authenticity of these passages. The sayings are Mark 16:16 and Matthew 28:19. The first is a part of a section which is thought to have been added to Mark when the original ending was lost, and the second is considered questionable because it contains the Trinitarian formula. It is highly probable that the present form of these sayings is not from Jesus, but it is likely that there was some basis for them in His original teaching. But, although the direct proof that Jesus taught baptism is somewhat unsatisfactory, yet there is considerable indirect evi-

dence for it. First, there is the fact that Jesus Himself

1. Gould, 'International Critical Commentary' St. Mark, pp.301-304.

H.B. Swete, 'Critical Commentary on St. Mark', p.376.

Peake, 'Commentary on the Bible', p.723.

was baptized (Matt.3:16, Mk.1:9, Lk.3:21). Had He regarded baptism as of no importance, He would not have submitted to the rite. Again, He was the successor of John in whose work baptism occupied such an important place that his name is always associated with it. It is natural to suppose that when John was put in prison and Jesus took up his work, He would carry on this part of it also (Matt.4:12,17). The Fourth Gospel directly states that Jesus baptized, "Although Jesus Himself baptized not, "but His disciples" (Jn.4:2). There can be no question that baptism was the practice of the early Church, and it is unlikely that they would have taken up the rite if Jesus had not placed His sanction upon it (~~The~~ Acts 2:38,41, 8:12). When we consider then that in two passages which may be authentic Jesus taught baptism, that He Himself was baptized, that His Forerunner used it, that the Fourth Gospel plainly says that it was Jesus' practice, and that the early Church as far back as we have any record seemed to take it for granted, it may be regarded as certain that He approved it.

2. But how did Jesus' use of baptism indicate His attitude toward the Gentiles?

In order to answer this question, we need to con-

sider the use which was made of the rite in the Judaism of Jesus' day. As has been said, the Jews taught that a Gentile must become a Jew before he could share in the blessings of salvation. The chief means by which this was accomplished in ancient Israel was circumcision. A man might become a member of the Jewish nation and accept the Jewish religion by undergoing this rite. Thus Abraham circumcised, not only his son and those who were born in his house, but also those who were bought with his money (Gen.17:23). But this ceremony had certain very obvious limitations. At the time when the rite was initiated, the female members of a man's household were regarded as his property, and, if he were accepted into the nation of Israel, it was not thought necessary to have a separate rite for them (Ex.20:17). But, as respect for womanhood grew and women were conceded the right to think and act for themselves, a new need would arise. Some women would be converted to Judaism when the male members of their household were not, and a method or ceremony had to be devised to solemnize their admittance to the nation. Baptism was one of the ceremonies chosen. W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box say: "Already before the advent of Christ it had been laid down by the Jewish religious

"authorities that when proselytes were admitted into the
 "fellowship of the covenant people, they should seal their
 "acceptance of the new faith by a threefold rite. First-
 "ly, they had to be circumcized....Secondly, they had to
 "be baptized...And thirdly, they had to offer sacrifice."¹

It must be remembered that the purpose of these rites was
 to admit Gentiles into the privileges of the Jewish nation
 and the Jewish religion. The Jewish male children were
 circumcized, but they were not baptized. Their Jewish
 blood was thought to make baptism unnecessary. Under such
 circumstances, if a Jew submitted to baptism it was equi-
 valent to admitting that his Jewish blood had no signifi-
 cance. It meant putting the Jew on exactly the same plane
 as the Gentile. It was this fact that gave such great
 significance to the baptism of John. W.K.L. Clarke says:
 "This rite had been demanded for some time past as the con-
 "dition of admittance into the ranks of the covenant people,
 "but for John to demand such an initiation of Jews was a
 "startling innovation. He was putting them in the position
 "of outsiders."² He made no distinction between Jew and

1. W.O.E; Oesterley and G.H. Box, 'The Religion and Worship
 of the Synagogue', p.281.

2. W.K.L. Clarke, Essay 'St. Peter and the Twelve' in
 F.J. Foalkes Jackson, 'The Parting of the Roads', p.182.

Gentile, but demanded that all should be baptized. He argued that the fact that a man could trace his ancestors back to Abraham would not save him. Even the proud and self righteous Pharisees and Sadducees must come to his baptism.

It has been shown that Jesus took up the work of John, and that in all probability He baptized as John had done. If so, most of His converts must have been Jews for He limited His work to the Jews, and if Jesus baptized Jews, it is clear that He did not recognize that their Jewish blood gave them a special right to the blessings of salvation. He did not share in the particularism of His contemporaries.

(c). The Direct Evidence for Universalism.

In addition to the various types of indirect evidence which we have considered, the Synoptics also contain some teaching which applies directly to the subject. This evidence is, of course, the most valuable of all. The actual number of sayings is not large, but it is sufficient to be fairly conclusive; and, when added to the other arguments which have been considered, makes a case so strong that it can scarcely be overthrown. These sayings are as follows: "And I say unto you that many shall come from

"the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven, but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into outer darkness" (Matt.8:11-12): "Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt.21:43): "And before Him shall be gathered all the nations: and He shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats" (Matt.25:32): "He will come and destroy those husbandmen, and will give their vineyard to others (Lk.20:6); "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all nations, beginning from Jerusalem" (Lk.24:47).

These sayings give a fitting climax to an argument which is strong already. The many who come from the east and the west can be no others than the Gentiles. The mention of the children of the kingdom who are to be cast out, shows that the Jews of the dispersion cannot be meant. The nation bringing forth the fruits of the kingdom is the spiritual nation of those that repent and believe and do the works of faith. The sheep and the goats among the nations are not the Jews and the Gentiles, but the righteous and the unrighteous in the Christian sense.

The "others" who are to receive the kingdom are the good among the Gentiles as well as among the Jews, and when repentance and remission of sins is preached among all nations it is assumed that all are capable of responding.

Summary:

This brings to an end our discussion of the question of Jesus' attitude toward the Gentiles. We have studied the origin of particularism and the attitude taken toward it by Jesus' contemporaries. We have examined the evidence of the Synoptics, and have found that, although there are some sayings in His teaching which may be interpreted as supporting particularism, yet these passages may also be explained in other ways, and there is a large body of direct and indirect evidence which tends to show His attitude to have been universalistic. We conclude, therefore, that Jesus conceived salvation to be open to all peoples on the same terms.

THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

- (1) The Markan passages.
- (2) The Q and M passages.

III. The Problem of Reconciling the Conflicting Conceptions of the Time when the Kingdom should Come.

How could Jesus consistently believe and teach the ideas found in all three of these types of teaching? The various theories.

(A). The eschatological elements were inserted into the records by early Christian tradition.

Theory held by Welhausen, Haupt, and others.
Popular with the liberal element in the Church.

(a). Arguments for the Theory.

- (1) The gospel records "have been tinged and colored "by the atmosphere of the early Church."
- (2) The Synoptics differ in the wording of the Parousia predictions.
- (3) The eschatological conception of the kingdom of God seems crude and materialistic. The weakness of this criticism.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

- (1) Some insertion of eschatology does not prove that all is inserted.
- (2) It is reasonable to suppose that there must have been some basis for the eschatological ideas of the gospels.
- (3) Eschatology is more prominent in Christian than in Jewish literature, and later disappeared entirely from the writings of the Jews.
- (4) There is no hint in the New Testament of a non-eschatological period before our gospels were written. The gospels came into being at a time when men would be more likely to tone down eschatological prophecies than to heighten them.
- (5) The cases of supposed heightening are not very convincing.

THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD(B). The Whole Life and Teaching of Jesus should be Interpreted in the Light of Eschatology.(a). Arguments in Favor of this Theory.

- (1) There is unquestionably a future element in the teaching of Jesus about the kingdom.
- (2) Much of the language of Jesus is eschatological. 'Kingdom of God', 'Son of man', 'Christ', and 'Messiah' are eschatological terms.
- (3) The reconstruction of the life of Jesus along eschatological lines is fairly convincing when Mark only is considered.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

- (1) It makes Christianity an extension of the hopes of men into the future rather than a realization of them.
- (2) If eschatology is central in Christianity, why is it that the Church has lived and thrived and made Jesus the very center of its life without placing any great emphasis upon the hope of His return?
- (3) If eschatology is central in the teaching of Jesus, why is this kind of teaching so limited?
- (4) There is some teaching in the Synoptics that suggests that this world will continue for a long time.

(c). The Conception of 'Interim Ethics'.

The essence of the conception.

Criticism of the idea.

- (1) It makes Jesus a misguided and mistaken enthusiast.
- (2) If the ethics of Jesus are interim ethics, it means an irreparable loss to the Christian Church.
- (3) The world-renouncing tendency is explained equally well by the imminency of death.
- (4) The demand for renunciation is due to the fact that no man can serve two masters.

THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

- (5) The ethics of Jesus are not of such character as to lend themselves to the support of this theory.

(C). Eschatology is a Survival of Judaism.

(a). Arguments in Favor of the Theory.

- (1) Jesus used language taken from the apocalyptic writings of the time.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

- (1) Parallels in Jewish thought do not show that an element is unessential in the teaching of Jesus.
(2) Eschatology is not something which Jesus outgrows, but it seems to represent a climax in His teaching.
(3) The fact that Jesus has modified and purified His eschatology by combining it with soteriology shows that it is not a mere survival.
(4) In some cases, eschatological sayings are among the most sacred and solemn utterances of Jesus.

(D). The Eschatological Elements in the Teaching of Jesus are Symbolical.

Various suggestions as to what they symbolize.

(a). Arguments in Favor of the Theory.

- (1) Much apocalyptical language is undoubtedly symbolical.
(2) The Fourth Gospel has spiritualized the eschatology of the Synoptics.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

- (1) If the eschatological elements in the teaching of Jesus were intended to be symbolical only, they failed to accomplish their purpose, for no one interpreted them in that way until the time of the Fourth Evangelist.
(2) None of the suggestions regarding what is symbolized agrees with the facts.

(c). Conclusion: Eschatology is symbolical, but not en-

THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

tirely so. There must be a general correspondence between the symbol and the things symbolized.

(E). Eschatology Represents the Teaching of Jesus in the Latter Part only of His Ministry.

Dr. Charles' statement of the theory.

(a). Arguments in Favor of this Theory.

- (1) It interprets Jesus in the light of the psychological reactions which are characteristic of other men under similar circumstances.
- (2) The emphasis of eschatology is greatest in the later teaching of Jesus.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

- (1) The theory requires the hypothesis of a definite turning point in the teaching of Jesus, and no such point can be found. The reasons why the incident at Caesarea Philippi cannot be so interpreted.
- (2) The concentration of eschatology in the latter part of the teaching of Jesus does not justify the assumption of a change in His way of thinking.

a. The scarcity of references to the future in the early part of the teaching of Jesus does not prove either that He had no conception of it or that His conception was different from that which He held later.

b. The emphasis on eschatology in the latter part of Jesus' life can be explained more satisfactorily on other grounds.

1. Eschatology could not be taught until a proper foundation had been laid for it.
2. As the time of His death drew near, it was natural that Jesus should speak more of His cross and His return in glory.

(F). Summary of Preceding Theories.

THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD(G). Constructive Theory.

The key to an understanding of Jesus' teaching about the kingdom is found in the parable of the sower. The kingdom is both present and future as a growing crop is both present and future. It is present in the sense that the seeds of it have been planted and are growing in the hearts of men; it is future in the sense of having a time of consummation which corresponds to the harvest of the crop.

(a). Arguments for the Theory.

- (1) It explains the presence of the three types of teaching in the Synoptics.
 - a. The non-eschatological teaching of Jesus is in harmony with it.
 - b. It explains transmuted eschatology.
 - c. It offers a satisfactory interpretation of pure eschatology.
- (2) It explains the existence of variations in the forecast of the time when the Parousia was to take place.
- (3) It justifies the belief in the early Church in the second coming of Christ.
- (4) It is not affected by the possibility that, in some cases, the Evangelists may have heightened or toned down the eschatology of certain sayings.
- (5) It accounts for the fact that God is said to give the kingdom.
- (6) It explains the emphasis of Jesus on His own life and work.

Summary of Chapter.

CHAPTER VII

THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GODI. Introduction.

(a). The problem of when the kingdom of God is to come is the third question previously mentioned as requiring our consideration before taking up the study of the salvation of the kingdom. This problem is forced upon our attention by the fact that a school of thinkers has arisen, and flourishes to-day, which contends that Jesus did not set up the kingdom or rule of God on the earth, but merely prophesied its establishment in the future. If this idea were proved, our contention that the kingdom embodied Jesus' conception of salvation would lose its significance. Instead of saving men by setting up the rule of God in

their hearts, Jesus, like John the Baptist, would be only a forerunner of the kingdom. We shall attempt to show that such ideas are not in harmony with Jesus' teaching in the Synoptics.

(b). The rise of this problem was due to the development of the historical viewpoint in Biblical study. Dobschütz points out that "Eschatology was not so long ago the ¹last chapter of dogmatics"; the New Testament was made to fit into the system of the theologian, and exegesis was dogmatical rather than historical. The change to the historical viewpoint has taken place during the last fifty years. Scholars have ceased attempting to make all parts of the Bible fit into a unified system, and have been inquiring what each individual writer or character has to say. With this change, the problem of eschatology has arisen. Men are asking the real meaning of the large group of eschatological sayings in the gospels, and the difficulties with reference to the time of the coming of the kingdom of God have become clear.

II. The Teaching of Jesus Regarding the Time of the Coming of the Kingdom.

The teaching of Jesus may be divided into three

1. E. Von Dobschütz, 'The Eschatology of the Gospels', p.3.

classes: teaching which does not specifically mention the kingdom; teaching which represents it as already established in the hearts of men and subject to growth and development; and eschatological teaching, that is, teaching which pictures the kingdom of God as something that is still in the future and is to come by a miraculous act of God. It will be seen that the real conflict is between the second and third of these classes of teaching. Inasmuch as it might be argued that one of these types represents the viewpoint of the writer of one or the other of our main sources rather than that of Jesus, we shall take pains to make it clear that both of the latter types are found in all of our sources.

(A). The Teaching which does not Specifically Mention the Kingdom.

In the first type of teaching, Jesus is a prophet and moral teacher: He does not talk about the kingdom; He does not speak of His own Messiahship; and His language is free from apocalyptic and eschatological elements. A very large part of the teaching of Jesus belongs in this category. It is found in all three gospels, and, although there is more of it in Q than in Mark, yet it is not lacking in Mark. It covers a wide range of thought: God's

providence and care for His creatures; God's Fatherhood and His love for His children; the importance of prayer, and the certainty of God's answer; man's attitude toward his neighbor, the law, ceremonial rites and observances, and paying tribute; the significance of forgiveness, marriage, divorce, and riches; and, the proper treatment of enemies, outcasts, women, and children. There is no occasion to study this material in detail, but the fact that there is more of it than of either of the other types, as well as the character of the material, should be kept constantly in mind as our study proceeds.

(B). The Teaching which Represents the Kingdom as Already Established in the Hearts of Men and Subject to Growth and Development.

(a). As has been said, the second type of teaching is that which represents the kingdom of God as already established in the hearts of men and subject to growth and development. This type is one of greatest concern for our problem, and will require a more detailed consideration. It, also, is found in all three gospels, and, although Q seems to be its main source, it is plentiful in Mark.

Dobschütz describes this type as 'transmuted eschatology'. He says that "what was spoken of in Jewish eschatology as to come in the last days is taken here as

"already at hand in the life time of Jesus."¹ We shall find this designation useful as our study proceeds.

(1). The Markan Passages in which the Kingdom is Represented as Already Present.

The chief passages in Mark in which the kingdom of God is represented as already present are Mk.1:14-15, 4:26-29. 30-32, 10:14, and 12:34.

In Mark 1:15, Jesus says "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." This passage is significant because it marks the opening of the ministry of Jesus. He does not say that the kingdom of God is already established, but He announces that the time is fulfilled and that it is near. The implication is that it is to be established immediately.

In the parables of the sower (Mk.4:3-20), of the seed cast into the earth (Mk.4:26-29), and of the grain of mustard seed (Mk.4:30-32), the kingdom is represented as present and capable of growth. It is to be "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear" (Mk.4:28).

In Mark 10:14, it is said of little children that "of such is the kingdom of heaven." The suggestion is that -----
1. Dobschutz, 'The Eschatology of the Gospels', p.150.

the kingdom is already in existence. The same thought is implied in the words "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God" (Mark 12:34).

A glance at any harmony of the gospels will show that most of these passages have parallels in both Matthew and Luke. The Markan verses, however, are the most important for our purpose because of the fact that some of the members of the extreme eschatological school, recognizing that Mark is our oldest gospel and one of the chief sources of the other two, have sought to explain away everything in it that was not in harmony with their eschatological conceptions, and have claimed that Mark represents Jesus as a pure eschatologist. That Mark contains eschatology will be shown when we consider the third type of teaching found in the gospels. It is only necessary to insist here that all the teaching of Jesus in Mark is not eschatological.

(2). The 'Q' Passages in which the Kingdom is Represented as Already Present.

The chief passages of this type in Q are as follows: Matt.12:28 which is equivalent to Lk.11:17-22, Matt.5:4-10 which is equivalent to Lk.6:20-23, Matt.11:5 which is equivalent to Lk.7:22-23, and Matt.11:11-12 which

is equivalent to Lk.7:28, 16:16.

Matt.12:28 reads: "If I by the Spirit of God
"cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you."
Luke speaks of "the finger of God" instead of the "Spirit of
"God". The meaning seems to be that the fact that Jesus
casts out devils by the Spirit or finger of God proves that
the kingdom of God has already been at least partially es-
tablished. W.C. Allen suggests that in this passage Jesus
thinks of the kingdom of God as "present, but only by anti-
"cipation."¹ This interpretation cannot be admitted, for
the argument of Jesus is that the presence of the power of
the kingdom proves the actual presence of the kingdom.
Mark has the substance of this incident, but not these words
(Mk.3:22-27). This fact, taken together with the similar-
ity of the wording of the extra material in Matthew and
Luke, would seem to indicate that all three gospels borrow-
ed the incident from Q.

The beatitudes in Matthew 5:4-10 and Luke 6:20-23
are also Q material. They proclaim the ethical require-
ments of the kingdom and the blessings that result from
fulfilling these requirements. Sometimes the kingdom seems
to be present, and sometimes future; but the beatitudes

1. Int. Crit. Commentary, St. Matthew, p.135.

are properly included in this group because they place membership in the kingdom on an ethical basis and ethics are timeless.

A third Q passage that belongs to this type of teaching is Matthew 11:5 which is equivalent to Lk.7:22-23. The passage in Matthew reads: "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them." The words are not a direct quotation, but they are undoubtedly suggested by Isaiah 29:18, 35:5-6, 61:1. Jesus interprets them as a picture of the blessings that will be enjoyed when the Messiah sets up His kingdom. Inasmuch as He was bestowing these blessings on men, He submits them as proof that He was the one that "cometh", and that the kingdom was being established. The best possible evidence of the presence of the kingdom was that the fruits, which were to be characteristic of it, were appearing.

There are many other passages from Q that may belong to this group, but one more will be sufficient.

Matthew 11:11-12 is roughly parallel to Lk.7:28 and Lk.16:16. The passage in Matthew reads: "Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than

"John the Baptist: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force." Jesus definitely says that the kingdom of heaven has been in existence from the time of John. "He that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is (ἐστίν) greater than he."

(3). The "M" and "L" Passages in which the Kingdom is Represented as already Present.

It is not certain that there are any M passages of this type. Matthew 23:13 may be such a passage, but Luke 11:52 appears to be a rough parallel. If so, it is probable that the two verses come from a common source, that is, from Q or an oral saying. But whatever the source, the verse in Matthew seems to speak of the kingdom of God as present.

The chief L passages are Luke 13:20-21 and 17:20-21. The first passage likens the kingdom of God to leaven hidden in meal. It is already established in the world working quietly among men and it is forecasted that by this process it will eventually reach a consummation which will be universal.

The second of the L sayings is the most important

of the type in the Synoptics. The words are: "And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, lo, here! or, There! for lo, The kingdom of God is within you." The importance of this verse is due to the fact that it is a direct answer to the problem which we are studying. Being asked when the kingdom of God cometh, Jesus replies that it is already present in the hearts of men. Plummer suggests that the phrase ^{ἐν ὑμῖν} ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ should be translated "is among you" inasmuch as the kingdom was not ¹ in the hearts of the Pharisees to whom Jesus was speaking. This would not alter the fact that He speaks of the kingdom as present.

These are the chief passages containing this type of teaching. They are found in all the Synoptic sources with the possible exception of M. There are many other sayings which probably should be grouped in this class, but their evidence is not needed.

(C). The Teaching which Represents the Kingdom as Future.

(a). As has been said, the third type of teaching about the kingdom is that which represents it in eschatological and apocalyptic terms. The kingdom is future and external.

1. Int. Crit. Commentary, St. Luke, p.406.

It will be shown that this kind of teaching is found in all three gospels, and in all the sources of the gospels with the possible exception of L. When compared with the other types of teaching, the total amount of it is not large.

(1). The Markan Passages in which the Kingdom is Represented in Eschatological and Apocalyptic Terms.

The chief passages in Mark in which the kingdom is spoken of as future are Mk.8:38-9:1, 9:47, 10:37, chapter thirteen, 14:25, and 14:62.

In Mark 8:38-9:1, Jesus speaks of the future coming of the Son of man, and identifies that event with the kingdom by saying: "There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." Mark 9:47 is a passage in which the time of the coming of the kingdom is doubtful, but the future is suggested. Mark 10:37 also seems to refer to the kingdom although the word is not used. In this verse, Jesus makes no protest when James and John speak of "thy glory". If the reference is to the kingdom, it must be a glorious consummation of it.

The thirteenth chapter of Mark with its parallels in Matthew and Luke is the most important section of eschatological teaching in the gospels. The word kingdom

does not occur in the chapter, but it can scarcely be doubted that some sort of a future consummation of the kingdom is contemplated. Verse twenty-six speaks of the "Son of man" coming in the clouds", and, as has been pointed out, Mark 8:38-9:1 make it clear that He identified this event with the kingdom's coming "with power".¹

Mark 14:25 and 14:62 are also verses of this type.

They add nothing to our knowledge, but they picture the king-

1. In 1864, Colani published his 'Jesus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son Temps', in which he advanced a theory that a Jewish apocalypse had been woven into this chapter along with material of Christian origin. A number of scholars have accepted this theory making modifications to bring it into harmony with the facts as they see them.

Dr. R.H. Charles belongs to this group. He designates as the verses which are included in the apocalypse, Mk.13: 7-8, 14-20, 24-27, and 30-31. These verses, taken alone, make a consistent unified discourse, and their extraction from the context seems to clarify its meaning and make it more of a unity than before. Dr. Charles suggests that this apocalypse is probably the oracle referred to by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl.III, v.3). He also shows by parallels from literature that much of the apocalypse is taken directly from Jewish sources. (See 'Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian', p. 325). Other scholars have argued (and we think, rightly) that, although materials have been used from Jewish sources, there are also authentic sayings of Jesus; consequently, we have a Jewish-Christian apocalypse. (See Dobschütz, 'The Eschatology of the Gospels', p.89). Among the arguments that would seem to confirm this idea are: the lack of the national and political elements that we would expect to find in a purely Jewish apocalypse; the presence of Christian universalism (verse 27); the parallels in other gospels which show that Matthew and Luke accepted this material as authentic teaching of Jesus; and the fact that, had Mark not believed this material to be from Jesus, he would not have used it.

dom as something which is to come in the future.

(2). The Passages in Q and M in which the Kingdom is Represented in Eschatological and Apocalyptic Terms.

The chief passages of this type in Q and M are:

Matthew 8:11-12 which is equivalent to Luke 13:28-29;

Matt.19:28 which is equivalent to Lk.22:29-30; Matt.24:14,

24:27 which is equivalent to Lk.17:34; Matt.24:37-41 which

is equivalent to Lk.17:25-37; Matt.25:31-46; and Luke 12:

42.

Matt.8:11-12 with its parallel in Lk.13:28-29 is distinctly future. The ideas do not have the same order in both gospels, but the wording is so nearly alike that we cannot doubt that the verses come from Q. It is not certain that Luke 22:29-30 is a parallel of Matthew 19:28. They do not have the same setting, and there is a difference in their wording that makes it doubtful whether they come from Q. Streeter does not include them in his reconstructed Q.¹ But whatever their origin, both sayings seem to regard the kingdom as future. Matthew 24:27 which is equivalent to Luke 17:24 and Matthew 24:37-41 which is equivalent to Lk. 17:25-37 are other probable Q passages which speak of the future coming of the Son of man. Matthew 10:23 and 25:31-

1. B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', p.291.

46 are verses of this type that probably come from Matthew's special source ¹ M. Matthew 24:14 may also be an M passage. It has a parallel in Mark 13:10, but does not seem to belong there. Sharman suggests that it is a gloss written in by some scribe, and later included in the text. The last saying that needs to be mentioned is Luke 12:32. The time when the Father is to give the kingdom is not certain, but the future is suggested. The verse is significant because, inasmuch as it has no parallels in Matthew and Mark, it probably comes from the source L.

This completes our study of the third type of teaching. It is clear that Mark, Q, M, and possibly L sometimes speak of the kingdom of God as future and coming suddenly by an act of God.

III. The Problem of Reconciling the Conflicting Conceptions of the Time when the Kingdom should Come.

If then these three types of teaching are found in the Synoptics, our problem is to explain how Jesus could have consistently believed and taught the ideas found in all of them. As has been said, the real conflict is between the second and third; consequently our task is to explain why Jesus sometimes speaks of the kingdom as if it were al-

1. H.B. Sharman, 'The Teaching of Jesus about the Future', p.142.

ready established and growing and at other times as if it were in the future and to come by an external act of God. Several different theories have been advanced and held by various scholars.

(A). The first theory which we shall consider is "that the eschatological elements in the teaching of Jesus have been inserted into the records by the influence of early Christian tradition, and that they reflect therefore the views¹ of the primitive church rather than the thought of Jesus."

Welhausen, Haupt and others have held this theory, and it has been accepted by a large portion of the liberal element in the Church in both England and America. It is especially attractive because it is such a simple solution of the problem, and it harmonizes well with modern ideas.

(a). The Argument for the Theory.

(1). In the first place, there is evidence that our records "have been tinged and colored by the atmosphere of the early Church."² The teaching of Jesus was especially susceptible to such influences because it remained in oral form for such a long period. There can be no doubt but

1.&2. H.T. Andrews, Essay on 'The Significance of the Eschatological Utterances of Jesus', p.68ff.
(London Theological Studies).

Professor Andrew's discussion of these theories is the best available.

that the air of Palestine at the time when the gospel records took shape was charged with eschatological ideas. We still possess much of the eschatological literature of the period, and its influence on the New Testament is well known. Even if there had been no ideas of this type in the teaching of Jesus, it would have been a miracle if none had crept in. We have evidence in some cases of what¹ seems to be a 'heightening' of eschatology, and when this is true, it is not unlikely that such ideas would get into the teaching of Jesus before it had taken a written form. Some of the sayings of Jesus would be especially susceptible to that type of interpretation. The basis of these sayings would be such things as the calamity that was to come upon Jerusalem, the trials and persecutions of the disciples, the assurance given the followers of Jesus that they would receive a reward for their faithfulness, and the conviction frequently expressed that God would realize His purpose in the world and that the truths which Jesus had taught would² ultimately conquer.

-
1. James Moffatt, 'The Theology of the Gospels', p.72.
Dr. Moffatt gives the following illustrations of this tendency: Matt.6:13; Matt.7:21 as compared to Lk.6:46; Mk.9:35 which is equivalent to Lk.22:26; the homiletical application of Matthew 12:40; and the eschatological turn given the parable of the widow and the judge (Lk.18:1ff).
 2. C.F. Kent, 'The Life and Teaching of Jesus', p.272.

(2). Again, this theory is supported by the fact that there is only one definite prediction of the Parousia in the Synoptics that is "transmitted in almost identical words in all three evangelists." This is Mark 13:26 which is equivalent to Matt.24:30 and Luke 21:27. The basis of this saying is in the little apocalypse of the thirteenth chapter of Mark; consequently its authenticity is doubtful. If the verse does not come from Jesus, we have no exact agreement in the Synoptics on any purely eschatological saying of Jesus; and, in every case in which such a saying is reported by all the Evangelists, one of them gives it in such a way that it may be interpreted without bringing in eschatology. See Matt.16:28, Mk.9:1, Lk.9:27; also Matt. 26:64, Mk.14:62, and Lk.22:69. It will be observed that in the first of these series, if Mark be regarded as the source of the other two, Matthew has distinctly heightened the eschatological element whereas Luke has lessened it, and in the second series, whereas Matthew's version is very close to that of Mark, again Luke has lessened the eschatology.

(3). The fact that the conception of the kingdom of heaven involved in eschatology seems crude and materialistic is a third argument which tends to suggest that this type of teaching has been inserted in the gospels. The rest of

the teaching of Jesus shows clearly that He had keen insight into moral and spiritual affairs. He made religion a matter of the heart; it is inner and spiritual. How then could He have believed in a kingdom of God which was to come, not by spiritual growth in the hearts of men, but by an external and spectacular act of God? Serious minded scholars have felt that such eschatology is an insertion in the records because it must be. To think otherwise is to think unworthily of Jesus. Much weight should be given to this idea, yet there are several thoughts which ought to be kept in mind. The first is that eschatology, however crude the form which it sometimes takes, had an honorable origin. It developed in times when the aspirations of the people of Israel had been thwarted, and the prospect of the earthly realization of their hopes was gone. Men of lesser faith would have given up in despair, but Israel's trust in Yahweh made them certain that He would ultimately prevail and bring to pass the triumph of His kingdom. Eschatology is the expression of that faith. It may be unworthy of Jesus, but it is not unworthy in itself. In addition to this fact, it must be kept in mind that it was impossible, even for Jesus, to picture the events of the future in terms which were entirely free from that which is external

and material, and, when we have made due allowance for figurative language, it is a fair question whether there is anything in the eschatological sections of the gospels that is unworthy of Him.

(b). The Arguments Against the Theory.

(1). First, although it is true that there was a "strong eschatological bias" in the atmosphere in which the gospels were written, and that this, no doubt, influenced their content, yet we are not justified in assuming that all the teaching of this type in the gospels had such an origin. We may frankly admit that there may have been elements in the teaching of Jesus that were not originally eschatological, and were made so in the process of their transmission; but it does not follow that all the eschatology of the gospels was a product of the same process.

(2). Moreover, if there were nothing in the teaching of Jesus that rightfully permitted of an eschatological interpretation, how are we to explain the fact that these ideas came to be associated with His name? It is hardly reasonable to suppose that they are all a product of misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

(3). This impression is emphasized by the fact, which Manson points out, that "Eschatology represents a more

"living and practical motive in early Christian than in
"Jewish literature. It became so associated with Chris-
"tianity, in fact, that before long the Jewish authorities
"renounced the apocalyptic eschatology altogether and
"placed their own apocalyptic writings on the index."¹

(4). It is false to argue that this association is a later development. It dates back to the earliest days of the Christian Church, and there is no hint in the New Testament of a non-eschatological period before our gospels were written. On the contrary the Fourth Gospel, which, as we have seen, is later than the Synoptics, gives very clear evidence of a trend in the opposite direction, and, when we consider that the gospels came into being at a time when men would be puzzled because of the non-fulfilment of eschatological prophecies, it seems much more probable that they would tone down such prophecies, as we have seen that Luke sometimes does, than that they would heighten them.²

(5). Moreover, the cases of supposed heightening are not very convincing. In the verses in which we have shown that Matthew heightens the eschatology, Mark and Luke usual-

1. Wm. Manson, 'Christ's View of the Kingdom of God', p.66.

2. The following passages seem to show this process: Compare Mk.13:14 and Lk.21:20, Mk.9:1 and Lk.9:27, Mk.14:62 and Lk.22:69.

ly have the Parousia idea in another verse of the same passage; consequently it is questionable whether very much heightening has taken place. (See Mk.8:38, Lk.9:26).

These arguments make it clear that the theory that eschatology is an insertion into the teaching of Jesus is of very doubtful validity.

(B). A second theory, which is almost the exact opposite of the first, has been proposed by Johannes Weiss, Albert Schweitzer, and others. They have contended that the whole life and teaching of Jesus can be interpreted properly only in the light of eschatology. Jesus was primarily an eschatologist. He believed that the kingdom of God was future, and that it would come during His own life time in an external manner and by a miraculous act of God. He had not founded it, and it was not of such a character that it could be established by men or advanced by their efforts. Man's attitude toward it must be entirely passive; he must wait and watch. Jesus did not think of Himself as the Messiah until after the return of the disciples from their missionary journey and the failure of His prediction that the end would come on that journey (Matt.10:5-42). He then realized that He was the Messiah, and came to believe that He must die in order to return in glory.

(a). Arguments in Favor of This Theory.

(1). In the first place, there is unquestionably a future element in the teaching of Jesus about the kingdom. This is to be expected, for there is no philosophy of human affairs that does not include a teleology, and "attempt to relate the existing course of things to their ¹ underlying idea or purpose." If Schweitzer and the members of his school meant this and nothing more, there would be no room for argument. This, however, is not their meaning. They mean that the teaching of Jesus was completely dominated by the eschatological idea that the kingdom of God was in the future and was to come in an external apocalyptic form.

(2). Again, it is argued that the language of Jesus is ² eschatological. Such fundamental terms as 'kingdom of God', 'Son of man', 'Christ', and 'Messiah' (found only in John), cannot be thought of apart from their eschatological origin and setting. This, of course, is true, but it would be equally true if Jesus used these terms in connection with the fulfilment of the eschatological hopes of the past.

They are as necessary for a discussion of 'transmuted escha-

1. Wm. Manson, 'Christ's View of the Kingdom of God', p.24.

2. Dobschütz has a very good discussion of Jesus' use of eschatological language. op. cit. pp.95-120.

tology' as for real eschatology.

(3). Finally, it may be said that there are certain sayings and incidents in Mark's account that can be explained more satisfactorily by this hypothesis than by any other. Schweitzer's reconstruction of the life of Jesus is quite convincing when Mark only is taken into consideration.

These arguments for the eschatological theory are not conclusive, but they are worthy of consideration.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

(1). The first criticism of this theory has already been suggested. If it be true, Christianity is not a realization of the hopes of men, but an extension of them into the future. Jesus was not the founder of the kingdom of God, but simply another forerunner of it. The importance which we are accustomed to attach to the life of Jesus and His death upon the Cross gives place to a new emphasis upon the Parousia. Either the kingdom of God did not represent His idea of salvation, as we contend, or He did not think of Himself as actually saving men during His lifetime. These considerations are sufficient to raise grave doubts about the theory.

(2). A second argument against the theory is that if

eschatology is the key to an understanding of the whole life and teaching of Jesus, it is very remarkable that the Christian Church can flourish so well without it.¹ It is possible that the hope of the Parousia may have been the dominating motive of the Church during the first half century of its history, but it could not be argued that its influence has been so great since that time. Somehow the Church has lived and thrived and made Jesus the very center of its life without placing any great emphasis upon the hope of His return. It is true that this hope has never been entirely given up, but there have always been many who do not feel that the value of Christianity depends upon it.

(3). A third argument which casts doubt on this theory is that there is much in the teaching of Jesus that apparently has nothing to do with eschatology. All of the first type of teaching discussed is of this character. It is not concerned with the conception that the end of the world is near, and it is difficult to harmonize some of it with such an idea.

(4). But not only do we have teaching that does not seem to contemplate a speedy ending of the world order, but there is some which suggests that the end will be postponed

1. See Dobschütz, 'The Eschatology of the Gospels', p.59.

for a considerable period or even indefinitely. Illustrations of this are found in Matthew 24:48 which is equivalent to Luke 12:45. In these verses, Jesus speaks of the servant who says, "My lord tarrieth", and, in Matthew 25:19, He says, "After a long time the lord of those servants cometh." When He speaks of the Church in Matthew 16:18-19 and 18:17-18, an indefinite time seems to be required for no such institution has yet been established, and Matthew 26:13 and Mark 14:9 also require a long period in which the Gospel shall be preached.

(c). The Conception of Interim Ethics.

It is sometimes argued, in behalf of the eschatological theory, that, if Jesus believed the end of the world to be near, His ethical teaching would be adapted to such a brief period as yet remained. Assuming this to be true, the advocates of the theory have urged that it is the best explanation of the world-renouncing tendency in His teaching. He could urge men to give away their cloaks, renounce all wealth, forgive their enemies, or receive with meekness the insults of others, because these things would have no significance when the new order had been ushered in.

- 1. These verses are found only in Matthew, and are of the character most likely to be inserted by the Church.

Several very powerful criticisms may be made of this conception.

(1). First, if Jesus believed the end of the world to be near and His ethics were intended only to guide the conduct of men during the interval, He was a misguided and mistaken enthusiast for no such end of the world has taken place.

(2). Moreover, if it be admitted that the ethics of Jesus are interim ethics, the result is an irreparable loss to the Christian Church; for the Church has long regarded the ethics of Jesus as a concrete expression of great ethical principles which are eternal.

(3). Again, the world-renouncing tendency is explained equally well by the imminency of death. Life is always a temporary matter, and no theory of a Parousia or a coming end of the world is necessary to explain Jesus' belief that it was foolish to lay up treasures on earth (Matt.6:19).

(4). When man is called upon to renounce something of real permanent value, the reason is not, as we have seen, that the end of the world-order is near, but that "no man can serve two masters" (Matt.6:24); consequently loyalty to God and His kingdom requires that a man shall be willing to renounce all other values however good they may be in

themselves.

(5). Finally, when the ethics of Jesus are properly understood, it is clear that they are not of such character as to lend themselves to the support of this theory. He did not seek to teach men how to adjust themselves to the world, but to God and their fellow men. The concern of His ethics was with personal relationships. Because this was true, it could make little difference whether this world remains, or another is set up in its place. So long as the fundamental nature of God and man is the same, the ethics of Jesus are eternally valid. It is true that, in teaching man how he ought to behave toward God and his fellow men, He sometimes spoke in terms of the life of His own day; but this should be regarded more as an illustration of the manner in which these great ethical principles should be applied than as legislation for that particular period. It is foolish to imagine that one who taught faith, love, brotherhood, sonship, repentance, and forgiveness was teaching for a limited period only. These ideas cannot be confined in boundaries of space and time.

(C). A third theory which has been proposed to harmonize the conflicting elements in the teaching of Jesus is that eschatology represents a survival of Judaism. It is a

sort of 'vermiform appendix' which Jesus was not able to eradicate because of His Jewish background and training. It does not represent a vital element in His thinking, but, as Andrews says, it "survives as a relic of old Judaism, and must be regarded as an anachronism in the¹ teaching of Jesus."

(a). Arguments in Favor of the Theory.

(1). There can be no question that Jesus did use language taken from the apocalyptic writings of the time. Dr. R.H. Charles, Dr. Thomas Walker, and others have made it clear that He read and was familiar with much of this literature.² Our problem is to determine whether these borrowed elements form a vital part of His thought, or are merely incidental to it.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

Dr. Andrews gives four objections to this theory.

(1). First, parallels in Jewish thought do not show that an element is unessential to the teaching of Jesus. His best thoughts were not always original. His teaching on forgiveness, for example, has parallels in the 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.'

1. H.T. Andrews, 'The Significance of the Eschatological Utterances of Jesus', 'London Theological Studies', p.79.
2. See Bibliography.

(2). Again, eschatology is not something which Jesus outgrows, but it seems to represent a climax in His teaching. If it had found expression in the early days of His ministry and was abandoned later for higher and more spiritual ideas, it would seem likely that this theory were true, but when we consider that eschatology seems to increase as His ministry goes on, it is impossible to believe that it had no significance for Him.

(3). Thirdly, eschatology is not a mere relic in the teaching of Jesus because such a survival would probably be in the same form in which it was found in Jewish literature whereas the eschatology of Jesus is a modified and purified eschatology. "When we read the gospels carefully we find "that Jesus has blended with the purely eschatological outlook another conception - the conception of the suffering servant derived from Deutero-Isaiah."¹ "The idea of the Parousia is constantly connected with death upon the cross."² When we see that Jesus has modified eschatology by carefully blending it with soteriology it is impossible to regard it as a mere survival in His teaching.

(4). Andrews' fourth argument is that "the eschatological sayings are among the most sacred and solemn utterances of Jesus". They are uttered in moments of great-

est spiritual inspiration or ecstasy, on days of crisis, and "during the tense and awe-inspiring time that "pre-³ceded the crucifixion." It is impossible to regard such utterances as incidental.

(D). A fourth theory which is proposed as a solution for our problem is that the eschatological elements in our gospels are symbolical. They are used to "veil His pre-⁴dictions of the future history of the Church." The Parousia predictions are a symbolical way of assuring His disciples of His continued presence with them after His resurrection.

As might be expected when it is assumed that the eschatological elements are symbolical, no agreement has been reached as to what they symbolize. Some have thought that the Parousia utterances are a prediction of the Resurrection; some, that they refer to the day of Pentecost; others, to His "perpetual spiritual advent"; still others, to the future of the Church; and finally there have been those who thought that they referred to the effect of His social teaching on the future history of civilization.

(a). Arguments in Favor of this Theory.

1,2,3,4. Again our quotations come from Andrews' essay and in the main we will produce his argument in our discussion of point (D).

(1). First, it cannot be doubted that much of the apocalyptic language is symbolical. The same kind of allowance must be made for symbolism in the words of Jesus as would be made anywhere in this type of literature.

(2). Moreover, the eschatology of the Synoptics has been spiritualized in the Fourth Gospel, and it is possible that a keen insight into the truth led the Fourth Evangelist to make this interpretation. He may have grasped the original meaning, whereas the Synoptic writers could not understand it because they lacked the proper quality of mind.

These arguments have value, and there is some truth in them; but they do not seem adequate to explain all the facts.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

(1). In the first place, if Jesus used eschatological language to symbolize any of the various things which have been suggested, He failed in His purpose, for there is no indication that anyone interpreted them in that way until the time of the Fourth Evangelist. To make such an assumption is to suppose that Jesus "spoke in riddles", and in such difficult riddles that, even with the aid of the Fourth Evangelist and centuries of Biblical study, scholars are not yet

agreed as to what His language symbolized.

(2). Moreover, none of the suggestions that have been made regarding what is symbolized will explain the facts. The theory that the Parousia is to be identified with the resurrection is contradicted by "the clear distinction¹ which is made between the two events in the gospel narrative." The theory that Pentecost is the event referred to is belied by the words of Jesus in The Acts: When He is asked whether He will "at this time restore the kingdom of "Israel", He replies, "It is not for you to know the times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority. But ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost is come upon you" (The Acts 1:6-8). These words make it clear that there is a distinction between the future of the kingdom and the Day of Pentecost. The theories regarding His "perpetual spiritual advent", the future Church, and the effect of His social teaching on the future history of civilization, are all contradicted by the fact that Jesus taught that the Parousia would be accomplished within His own generation (Mk.13:30). His "injunctions to watchfulness are quite out of keeping with the idea involved in² the continuous advent."

1. H.T. Andrews. op. cit. p.85-86.

2. H.T. Andrews. op. cit. p.87-88.

(c). Our conclusion must be then that, although much of the eschatological teaching of Jesus is symbolical, yet it is a mistake to regard it as entirely so. Jesus uses the language of imagination in describing the things of the future, but it is only reasonable to believe that there would be such a correspondence between the symbol and the thing symbolized that His hearers would be given at least a general conception of the truth. We need not suppose that they completely understood it, but, unless we are to think that Jesus purposely spoke in unintelligible riddles, we must believe that He regarded His language, symbolical as it was, as the best available instrument of conveying to His hearers as much of the truth as they were capable of understanding.

(E). Still another attempt has been made to harmonize the conflicting elements in the teaching of Jesus. It is argued that all of these elements are authentic, but we are to distinguish between them on a chronological basis. Dr. R.H. Charles gives a splendid summary of this theory: "At the outset of His ministry He had, we can hardly doubt, hoped to witness the consummation of this kingdom without passing through the gates of death. But the accomplishment of His task was dependent upon the conduct of the

"people. In the earlier days when His preaching was received with enthusiasm and the nation seemed to be pressing into the kingdom of God, His teaching dwells mainly on the present kingdom of God on earth. The possibility therefore of its consummation through a natural development seemed a natural expectation. But when the temper of the people changed and His rejection and death appeared as an inexorable necessity, He began to speak of the future kingdom. He never relinquished, indeed, the thought of the present kingdom, but, whilst holding it fast, He saw that if it were ultimately to prevail, it must receive its consummation in the future by the direct intervention of God, or rather by His own return to judge¹ the world."

(a). Arguments in Favor of this Theory.

(1). First, it seeks to interpret Jesus in the light of those psychological experiences which have been characteristic of other men under similar circumstances. Men of great faith, when they are disappointed in the natural fulfilment of that which they believe to be God's will, are prone to expect its fulfilment by supernatural means. Is it not possible that this is the note sounded when Jesus

1. R.H. Charles, 'Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian', pp.320-21.

says: "Fear not little flock; for it is your Father's "good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Lk.12:32)?

(2). Again, there seems to be little doubt that the eschatological element does occupy a larger place in the teaching of Jesus in the latter part of His ministry. We have no satisfactory chronology of the life of Jesus, and it is sometimes impossible to be certain about the period to which particular sayings belong. Other passages, however, can be dated with a fair degree of accuracy, and such verses give us reason to believe that Jesus used eschatological language more frequently in the later days of His ministry than in the earlier. Mark does not have a single saying of this type until after the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, and he definitely dates the great eschatological chapter (Ch.13) during the closing days of Jesus' life. Matthew and Luke have very little pure eschatology which does not have parallels in Mark; Matthew has none, which is not subject to question, before the eighth chapter; and Luke, none before the thirteenth.

But, although this theory has much to be said in its favor, yet there are also some things to be said against it.

(b). Arguments against the Theory.

(1). In the first place, if it be true that the life of Jesus can be divided into two periods, and that in the first He expected to establish the kingdom of God during His own generation and believed Himself to be establishing it, whereas in the second He believed that the kingdom was future and would not come until He returned in glory, then we would expect to find a very definite turning point in His life. Before that point, all the teaching would be of one type, and after that point, it would be of another. As a matter of fact, however, although there is a definite point in Mark where the eschatological teaching begins, yet the non-eschatological teaching does not stop at that place. Mark 10:14 and 12:34 belong to the non-eschatological teaching, although both are later than the incident at Caesarea Philippi. Moreover, it is evident that neither Matthew nor Luke recognized the incident at Caesarea Philippi as such a turning point as this theory would require, for much of the teaching which regards the kingdom of God as already established and subject to growth is recorded in both gospels after this event. If this be true, it is doubtful whether Q makes any distinction in the teaching of Jesus on this basis. It is incredible that if both Mark and Q recognized the incident at Caesarea Philippi, or any other incident,

as a turning point in the teaching of Jesus, Matthew and Luke could have ignored it. If there were a turning point, the sources from which our Evangelists drew their material presented it in such a manner that it made very little impression on Mark and none on Matthew and Luke.

(2). Again, although it is true that the greater part of the eschatological teaching of Jesus seems to have been given in the latter part of His ministry, it by no means follows that any great change had taken place in His way of thinking. There are several things which should be kept in mind in considering this point.

a. First, if Jesus never discussed the future at any length before the incident at Caesarea Philippi, it need not be supposed that He had no conception of it; and certainly there is no reason to suppose that He had a different conception before that event than after it. His references to the future in Mark 2:20, 3:28-29, and 6:11 are in perfect harmony with the conceptions that He reveals later.

b. In the second place, the emphasis upon eschatology in the latter part of the teaching of Jesus can be explained more satisfactorily on other grounds.

1. When we consider the character of the eschatology of Jesus, it becomes evident that it could not be taught

until a proper foundation had been laid for it. No one would think of teaching a student advanced mathematics until he had learned the elementary facts about the use of numbers; so, if we are to believe that Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God differed from prevailing ideas on the subject, we must recognize that it would have been foolish to talk ^{it} ~~if~~ its future coming before His hearers had an understanding of what it was that was to come. It would have confused them greatly to have spoken of a second coming before they had learned the meaning of the first. Would we not expect then that eschatology would come in the later rather than in the earlier part of the teaching of Jesus?

2. But, there is another reason. As the time of Jesus' death drew near, it was natural that He should think and speak more of His Cross and His return in glory than had been His custom during the first part of His ministry. Had He failed to do so, His disciples would have been totally unprepared for the heart-rending events which followed. The permanence of His life work could be insured only by teaching them the significance of the future. And from His own personal standpoint, as the time of His death drew near, He would have been less than human had He not attempted to see into the future, and, seeing, told what He saw

to those who were nearest and dearest to Him.

These arguments are sufficient to make it clear that the theory, which seeks to harmonize the different types of the teaching of Jesus by postulating two periods in His life during which He taught two entirely different conceptions of the kingdom, is not satisfactory.

(F). Summary of Preceding Theories.

We have now considered the five leading theories which have been advanced to explain the seeming contradictions in the teaching of Jesus with reference to the time of the coming of the kingdom of God. We have found that, although there has been some heightening of eschatology in the process of transmission, yet eschatology cannot be regarded as an insertion in our records. We have found also that it is a mistake to interpret all His life and teaching in eschatological terms. We have seen that in an eschatological atmosphere it is natural that some of the prevailing ideas would creep into the gospels as relics of outworn thought, but we have made it clear that such a theory will not explain the presence of all the eschatology of the Synoptics. We have recognized that much of the language of eschatology is symbolical, but have not been willing to conceal the difficulties of our problem by allegorizing it.

And finally, we have admitted that most of the eschatological teaching comes during the latter part of the ministry of Jesus, but have shown that this does not justify the hypothesis of two periods in His ministry during which He had entirely different conceptions of the time of the coming of the kingdom. None of these theories has satisfactorily solved our problem, but each of them has contributed something to its final solution. Can we find a theory then that is in harmony with the facts, and, while recognizing the truth in these other theories, avoids their weaknesses? In other words, can we find a solution for the problem of the time of the coming of the kingdom of God that is a sort of "least common multiple" of all the facts to be found in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus?

(G). Constructive Theory.

Such a theory seems to be suggested by Jesus in the fourth chapter of Mark in the parable of the sower and the other parables of seeds cast into the ground. The gist of the theory as we interpret it is this: Jesus believed that He came into the world to sow the seeds of the kingdom of God. In a sense, the kingdom was present as soon as the seeds were sown just as a farmer might speak of having a field of wheat as soon as he had sown the wheat. But in

another sense, the kingdom would not come until its final consummation just as the farmer would say that he had no wheat until the harvest. Jesus' conception of the kingdom followed the analogy of the sower in a number of points. His relationship to the kingdom was much the same as the farmer's relationship to the harvest. There could be no crop unless the farmer sowed the seed, and there could be no harvest unless he harvested it. So, in the same way, the kingdom of God did not come and could not come until Jesus came to sow its seeds in the hearts of men, and its final consummation would never be realized until He returned in glory. Just as the farmer has a task to perform if his crop is to be a satisfactory one, so Jesus by His life and, above all, by His death would make the harvest of the kingdom a truly great one. As the farmer's crop depends on the fertility of the soil, so also the glorious triumph of the kingdom depended in part on the receptivity of the minds of men to the Divine seed. As the farmer sows and cultivates, but God gives the increase; so the kingdom is to be regarded as a gift of God. As the seed in the beginning is small, but grows until it reaches maturity; so the kingdom is started in a small way with Jesus' own life, teaching, and death, but later, when His

message has been taken up and preached by others, the kingdom will grow until it reaches its consummation. As tares thrive among the wheat, so evil men will continue to thrive among the good.¹

In view of the many volumes which have been written on the problem of the kingdom of God, this theory seems too simple to be adequate. But when we remember that Jesus always sought to make the greatest truths of God as simple and clear as possible, we may well ask whether this isn't the true explanation after all. Let us see then how it accords with the facts.

(a). Arguments for the Theory.

(1). First, this theory explains the presence of the three different types in the teaching of Jesus. The purely ethical teaching, which seems completely independent of the kingdom of God, is really quite in harmony with it, because the kingdom which is growing and will grow from the seeds which Jesus is sowing in the hearts of men, is primarily an ethical relationship with God. The teaching which we have called transmuted eschatology is in harmony with this theory because the theory recognizes that the kingdom is a present good. Jesus is not merely extending the

1. Beyschlag holds a theory essentially the same as this.
See 'New Testament Theology', Vol.I, pp.49-54.

hopes of His people; He is fulfilling them; the Kingdom of God is actually here. The teaching which regards the kingdom of God as future and coming at the time of the return of Jesus is also in harmony with this theory because Jesus does not regard the kingdom as present in the fullest sense until its final consummation.

These results become even more evident when we examine our sources in detail in the light of this theory.

a. All of the ethical teaching of Jesus is in perfect harmony with it; love of God and man, prayer, repentance, forgiveness, purity, sincerity, faithfulness in marriage, kindness to all men, willingness to serve and sacrifice, and making worldly goods secondary to spiritual values. If the kingdom of God is essentially an ethical relationship which is in the process of being established, these are exactly the things which we would expect Jesus to teach.

b. The same thing is true when we consider the transmuted eschatology. The sayings at the opening of the ministry of Jesus, the verses which imply the presence of the kingdom of God because the fruits of the kingdom are being manifested, the parable of the sower and its other version in Mk.4:26-29, the parable of the grain of mustard seed, the

the sayings about the relation of

John the Baptist to the kingdom, the beatitudes and woes which deal with the kingdom of God, and the verse about the kingdom of God coming not with observation but being within or among men, are all in harmony with the conception of a growing kingdom. These sayings require that the kingdom shall be present, but they do not demand that it shall be in its fully consummated form. It is true that it is already bearing fruit, but no one expects any analogy to work out in every detail. Even in this point, the analogy will hold if we regard the seed as that of a fruit tree rather than of a grain of wheat, for we know that fruit trees begin to bear fruit before they are mature.

c. As has been said, the teaching which regards the kingdom as future is also in harmony with this theory. What better explanation could we hope to find for the phrase "till they have seen the kingdom of God come with "power"? (Mark 9:1). The parallel passages in Mark 9:47 and Matt.18:19 and the incident of the request of the mother of the sons of Zebedee in Mark 10:37 and Matt.20:21 are satisfied by the hypothesis ~~that~~ the future glory is the consummation of the kingdom already established, although we need not suppose that James and John understood this at the time. Our treatment of Mark 13 and the parallel

passages in Matthew and Luke has made it clear that this is the chief source of pure eschatology, and that it is a very complex passage. But when we have subtracted such verses as deal only with the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, and have made due allowance for the highly imaginative and symbolical description of the afflictions which are to come upon the disciples and the signs and wonders which are to precede the Parousia, we find that here also Jesus is speaking of His return in glory for the final consummation of the kingdom. Verse 34 makes this clear, and the verses which follow show that the real meaning of the sayings which admonish the disciples to watch is that Jesus will return again to the earth to consummate His kingdom, and they must be ready when He comes. Verses 26 and 27 confirm the same idea. The other passages which we considered in our discussion of this type of teaching are also in harmony with the theory. It becomes evident then that this hypothesis does explain most of the seeming contradictions in Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God. But, there are still other things to be said in its favor.

(2). In the first place, it explains the existence of variations in the forecast of the time when the Parousia

was to take place. Matt.10:²³~~13~~ predicts the coming of the Son of man before the disciples had gone throughout the cities of Israel; Mk.9:1 and 13:30 prophecy His coming in that generation; Matt.24:14 and Mk.13:10 say that the Gospel must first be preached unto all nations and then shall the end come; and Mk.13:32 says that no one knoweth the time of the final triumph of the kingdom except the Father. If Jesus believed that its consummation depended in part on the receptivity of men, what could be more natural than that in times of success He would think that the great event was very near, and in times of discouragement He would remove it further into the future.

(3). Again, this theory, by accepting eschatology as a genuine element in the teaching of Jesus, explains and justifies the existence in the early Church of a belief in the second coming of Christ.

(4). It is not affected by the possibility that the Evangelists may, in some cases, have heightened the eschatology of some sayings, or that others may be the outworn relics of Jewish beliefs. There is plenty of room in it for the symbolism which the gospels unquestionably contain and the emphasis on eschatology in the latter part of Jesus' ministry only confirms its validity.

(5). Further, the fact that God is said to give the kingdom is explained by the analogy of God giving the harvest. At the same time, the limitations of God's power to give is involved in the conception of the various kinds of soil. God cannot give a harvest on stony ground or among thorns; neither can He establish His kingdom if the hearts of men are hard and unreceptive or are harboring sin.

(6). Most important of all, this theory explains the great emphasis which Jesus always placed on His own life and work. He Himself is the sower; His word is the seed of the kingdom of God; it is of eternal significance. "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away" (Mk.13:31). But it is not enough that the seed shall be sown. Jesus is, in a sense, both the sower and the seed. He must suffer and die for the sins of men, and His sacrifice will help to bring in the consummation of the kingdom. He does not merely wait, and He is not passive. His work is of tremendous importance to the kingdom, and absolutely essential to its coming. "The Cross is the condition of His fulfilment of His Messianic destiny, and therefore it is by the Cross that the kingdom of God comes with power."

1. Wm. Manson, 'Christ's View of the Kingdom of God', p.140.

It may be argued against this theory that the Parousia did not take place, and that Jesus was mistaken in His predictions. This may be readily admitted, but it must be remembered that His forecast of His own return was based upon His faith that God would ultimately triumph in His purpose to redeem men, and upon His conviction of His own significance for that purpose. In a large measure, the history of the Church has confirmed both of these beliefs. The method by which these things would be accomplished could not have been a matter of great importance to Jesus, and, after all, the Parousia was only a method.

Summary:

In this chapter, we have considered the problem of the time of the coming of the kingdom of God. We have found that there are three types of teaching in the Synoptics: there is a large body of sayings which do not mention the kingdom; a second group of passages which speak of it as present in the hearts of men and subject to growth and development; and a third section of teaching which pictures it as future. We have recognized that there seems to be a lack of harmony between these types, and we have examined the various theories which have been

advanced to explain it. We have found that each of these theories has something to commend it, but that none of them is entirely satisfactory. Finally, we have argued that the supposed lack of harmony in the teaching of Jesus about the time of the coming of the kingdom can be explained by the parable of the sower. The kingdom is like a seed that is sown. In one sense, the crop is present as soon as the seed is sown and begins to grow, and, in another, there is no crop until the harvest.

This then, we believe, is the true solution of the problem of the time of the coming of the kingdom of God: it is both present and future; it is established by Jesus, and it is consummated by His return in glory; it is the realization of the aspirations of the past, and it is the confident hope of the future.

THE KINGDOM AND ITS SALVATIONI. Introduction.

(a). Review of the preceding study and statement of problem. The kingdom of God embodies Jesus' conception of salvation. This conception is determined to a large extent by His ideas regarding the evils from which man needs to be saved.

(b). The different terms used for the kingdom have essentially the same meaning.

(c). Reasons for holding that the kingdom represents Jesus' conception of salvation.

- (1) There is no alternative theory in the Synoptics.
- (2) The blessings which accompany membership in the kingdom are sometimes identified with eternal life, and eternal life is a generally accepted word for salvation throughout the New Testament.

II. The History of the Kingdom Idea.

(a). The origin of the kingdom idea.

(b). The Old Testament ideas regarding the agent by which it was to be established.

(c). The psychological root of the kingdom conception.

(d). The manner in which the kingdom was to be established. The Messianic son of David - the supernatural Messiah. The Servant of Jehovah conception of Deutero-Isaiah not applied to the Messiah before the time of Jesus.

(e). The relation between Jesus' conception of the kingdom and that of the Old Testament.

III. The Meaning of the Kingdom for Jesus.

THE KINGDOM AND ITS SALVATION

(a). Definitions of the kingdom.

(b). Definitions may be divided into two classes: (1) those which describe the kingdom itself, and (2) those which picture the blessings which accompany the establishment of the kingdom. The kingdom itself is the rule or reign of God.

(c). Differences between Jesus' understanding of the rule or reign of God and prevailing conceptions.

- (1) Jesus' contemporaries thought of the sphere of God's rule to be the external world; Jesus locates it in the heart.
- (2) They expected God's rule to displace that of Rome; He believes it was to take the place of the rule of Satan.
- (3) They expected God to rule by force; He believes that the method will be love.
- (4) Both He and His contemporaries are agreed that the kingdom is a gift of God.
- (5) They differ with reference to the nature of the evils from which the kingdom delivers men.

IV. The Salvation of the Kingdom of God.

(A). Salvation and God.

The salvation offered by membership in the kingdom removes the disastrous effects caused by sin on man's relationship with God.

(a). The establishment of the kingdom of God in a man's heart removes the offense to God caused by sin.

(b). It establishes fellowship and communion between man and God.

(c). It brings a man God's forgiveness.

(B). Salvation and Satan.

THE KINGDOM AND ITS SALVATION

(a). The establishment of the rule of God in a man's heart gives him strength to resist temptation.

(b). It may result in curing disease and producing physical health.

(c). When the effect of the work of Satan is regarded as bondage, the establishment of the rule of God gives a man freedom.

(C). Salvation and One's Fellow Men.

Jesus believes that most of the economic, social, and political problems of men are caused by sin.

(a). The establishment of the rule of God saves men from economic poverty.

(b). The kingdom offers salvation from the evils which arise out of differences of race, nationality, tradition, training, and sex.

(c). The kingdom also saves men from political evils.

(D). Salvation and Self.

The chief benefits of the rule of God are enjoyed by the individual in whose heart He rules. These benefits apply both to the present life and to that which is to come in the future.

(a). The Benefits which the Kingdom of God Bestows on the Individual in the Present Life.

- (1) The physical benefits have been discussed already.
- (2) Intellectual benefits.

a. Gives him a knowledge of God.

b. Initiates him into the mysteries of the kingdom.

- (3) Moral and spiritual benefits.

Discussion of the idea of a 'perfectly integrated

THE KINGDOM AND ITS SALVATION

personality! The kingdom of God offers a man an ideal around which he may organize his life. This ideal big enough to call forth all his energies and powers. The results of such integration:

- a. It changes his corrupt character into a good one.
- b. It gives the will freedom to make right choices.
- c. It gives a man inner peace and harmony.
- d. The final result is joy and happiness.

(b). The Benefits which the Kingdom of God Bestows on the Individual in the Life to Come.

- (1) It saves him from physical punishment.
- (2) It gives him eternal life.
- (3) It insures eternal joy and happiness.

Summary.

CHAPTER VIII

THE KINGDOM AND ITS SALVATIONI. Introduction.

(a). In our previous study, we have considered the natural man and the natural man corrupted by sin; we have discussed the problem of moral freedom and inquired into the question as to whether salvation is available for all; we have suggested that a man's idea of the nature of salvation is largely predetermined by his conception of the evils from which men are to be saved; we have stated as a guide for our future study that Jesus' ideas of salvation are embodied in the kingdom of God; and finally, because the contention that the kingdom of God is entirely future would invalidate our argument, we have examined the evidence and

considered the various theories regarding the time of the coming of the kingdom, and have concluded that it is both present and future in harmony with the analogy of a growing crop. In this chapter, we shall consider the nature of the kingdom of God, and shall seek to establish our claim that it embodied a conception of salvation corresponding to Jesus' ideas of the evils from which man needs to be saved.

(b). Although we shall use the term 'kingdom of God' in our discussion, yet it must be kept in mind that this is not the only expression for the idea in the Synoptics. It is the favorite term in Mark and Luke, but Matthew seems to prefer 'the kingdom of heaven', and both Matthew and Luke occasionally speak of 'the kingdom' without any additional phrase. These three terms designate essentially the same idea. Stevens points out that the kingdom of heaven is¹ heavenly, "that is, Divine in origin and character."

Other scholars have also made distinctions in meaning, but nearly all are agreed that the fundamental meaning of the terms is the same. The reason for this belief is found in the fact that the Evangelists use the terms more or less interchangeably. See Mk.1:15 and Matt.4:17; also Matt.5:3

1. G.B. Stevens, 'The Teaching of Jesus', p.58.

and Lk.6:20. For our purposes then, it is clear that no distinction need be made.

(c). Although the study which follows will justify the idea that Jesus identifies the benefits of salvation with the blessings which result from membership in the kingdom of God, yet two of the general arguments for the conception may be pointed out here.

(1). In the first place, we are justified in believing that Jesus identifies the benefits of salvation with the blessings of membership in the kingdom of God because there is no alternative theory in the Synoptics. It might be argued that He identifies salvation with doing the will of God (Matt.7:21), with keeping the commandments (Mk.10:17-19), with unreserved love for God and one's fellow men (Mk. 12:3-31), or with confessing Christ before men (Matt.10:32); but it will be seen that these are only different ways of expressing what is required of a man who has been admitted to membership in the kingdom.

(2). Again, Jesus identifies the blessings which accompany membership in the kingdom with eternal life, and eternal life is a generally accepted word for salvation throughout the New Testament. (See Jn.3:15, 4:36, 5:39, 6:54,68, 17:2, ~~The~~ Acts 13:48, Rom.2:7, 5:21, 6:23, I Timothy 6:12,

19, etc. The proof of this point is found in the tenth chapter of Mark. In verse 17, a rich man asks Jesus, "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Jesus tells him to sell all he has and give the money to the poor, and when the rich man went away sorrowful, Jesus says to His disciples, "How hardly shall they that have riches "enter into the kingdom of God!" (Mk.10:23). The man asks about inheriting eternal life, but Jesus speaks of entering the kingdom of God. It is evident that the two ideas were interchangeable in His mind, or, at least, that they were both ideas for salvation.

II. The History of the Kingdom Idea.

(a). In considering Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God, it is necessary to remember that the idea did not originate with Him. It had a long history before the time when He began to teach and preach that it was "at hand". Dr. Charles says that the idea first appeared in the thinking of Israel about the eighth century B.C.¹ But Dr. James Stalker dates it as late as the book of Daniel in which the worldly kingdoms of gold, silver, iron, and clay are destroyed by a kingdom represented by a stone hewed out of

1. R.H. Charles, 'Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian', p.82.

mountain (Dn. 2nd chapter).¹

(b). Sometimes the kingdom was thought to be established by a direct act of God, and sometimes through the agency of a Messiah. The details varied at different times, and conflicting conceptions were held by various individuals at the same time. Ideas of the future are always somewhat fluid; they change with the changing experiences of men. The kingdom of God in Jewish thought² was an idea of this character. But, in spite of all its changes and variations, there were certain elements in it that were constant. It was always an ideal future age; an era when God would rule; and a time when Israel, or, at least, the righteous remnant of Israel would be vindicated. Usually it was believed that the enemies of Israel would be overthrown, and that the nation would prosper under the direct rule of God or His Messiah.

(c). The root of the kingdom idea was in the deep religious faith of the Jewish people. As we have seen, they believed that Yahweh was a righteous God, and that Israel was His chosen nation; consequently, when affliction and oppression came upon them, they could not believe that it

1. James Stalker, 'The Teaching of Jesus Concerning Himself', p.139.

2. See D.M. Ross, 'The Teaching of Jesus', p.129.

was permanent. When present conditions were intolerable, they pictured to themselves a future time when Yahweh would vindicate His own righteousness and justice, and Israel would be restored to prosperity and happiness.

(d). When a Messianic agency was recognized, there seems to have been at least two strains of thought regarding the manner in which the kingdom was to come. In one of them, the kingdom would come in a natural way; God would raise up a Messiah of the house of David, and this Messiah would overcome the enemies of Israel and establish the reign of God. In the other, the coming of the kingdom was to be apocalyptic. A supernatural Messiah would appear suddenly on the clouds of heaven (Dn.7:13), and the kingdom would be established in a miraculous way. The suffering servant conception of Deutero-Isaiah does not seem to have been applied to the Messiah before the time of Jesus.

A great deal more might be said of the kingdom of God idea in Jewish thought, but this is sufficient both to indicate that the idea was not new at the time of Jesus and to show its main content.

(e). This brings us to our study of Jesus' conception of the meaning of the kingdom. It will be found that, al-

though He takes the idea from Jewish thought and, in many respects, retains the elements which He found in it, yet, in others, He transforms it and makes it very different from prevailing Jewish ideas. Professor Beyschlag says:

"He was conscious of meaning the same thing as His hearers, yet the more definite notions about the kingdom of God differed widely in the nation itself, according as people's thoughts were deep or superficial, ^{sp} spiritual or worldly, and even to the most earnest and spiritual it was only a picture of fancy which, as all prophecy, and still more all interpretations of prophecy, is imperfect, was far from corresponding to the fulfilment desired by God. But the question with Jesus was the Divine fulfilment, first the pure and perfect truth of the idea, and then the way in which it might be realized."

III. The Meaning of the Kingdom for Jesus.

(a). If we attempt to define Jesus' conception of the kingdom, we find that we have a very difficult task. He frequently tells us what it is like; He makes comparisons, and draws analogies; He speaks of its joys and blessings; He describes what men must do to enter it, and the conduct

1. Beyschlag, 'New Testament Theology', Vol.I, p.45.

of its members; but He never tells us exactly what it is. Many students of the subject have tried to define it, but no definition is universally satisfactory.

Professor Bruce says it is "The reign of Divine
"love exercised by God in His grace over human hearts be-
"lieving in His love, and constrained thereby to yield Him¹
"grateful affection and devoted service."

Augustine defines it as "The most perfectly har-
"monious and organized society enjoying God and one another²
"in God."

Professor Shailer Matthews pictures it as "An
"ideal (though progressively approximated) social order in
"which the relation of men to God is that of sons, and,
"(therefore) to each other, that of brothers."³

Dr. Moffatt speaks of it as "The order and sphere
"of bliss for men, bliss being conceived as perfect loyalty
"to the will of the Father, or as life in the fullest sense⁴
"of the term."

Other definitions that have been given are: "A
"community of people here and hereafter, who shall be in a

1. A.B. Bruce, 'The Kingdom of God', p.46.

2. Quoted by F.R. Barry, 'Christianity and Psychology', p.81.

3. Shailer Matthews, 'The Social Teaching of Jesus', p.54.

4. James Moffatt, The Theology of the Gospels, p.68.

"new sense righteous;"¹ "The perfect form of Theocracy"²
 "of which all the prophets had spoken;" "The family of"³
 "the reborn sons of God;" "The world of invisible laws"⁴
 "by which God is ruling and blessing His creatures;" and
 "The idea of a Divine dispensation under which God would
 "bestow His full salvation upon a society of men, who, on
 "their part, should fulfil His will in true righteousness."⁵

(b). A careful analysis of these definitions will show that they may be divided into two classes in accord with the viewpoint from which the kingdom is regarded. Bruce, Muirhead, Hort, and Wendt think of it as the rule or reign of God, whereas the other writers quoted speak of it in terms of the society and the blessings resulting from the reign. Wendt's definition brings out this distinction. He defines the kingdom as a "Divine dispensation", and then adds "under which God would bestow" certain blessings. The thing itself is the Divine dispensation or rule of God; but God's rule is over a society of men who enjoy all the benefits of salvation. Dr. Moffatt recognizes this fact in an-

 1. Thomas Walker, 'The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age', p.101.

2. L.A. Muirhead, D.C.G. Vol.I, p.525.

3. J..Middleton Murry, 'The Life of Jesus', p.112.

4. Dr. Hort, 'Life and Letters', II p.273.

5. H.H. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', I p.175.

Several of these definitions are borrowed from Stevens, 'The Teaching of Jesus', pp.67-68.

other passage when he says: "The Greek term βασιλεία as
 "used in the gospels is better translated reign or sover-
"eignty than kingdom in perhaps the majority of instances." ¹
 If this be true, Jesus' conception of the essential nature
 of the kingdom is revealed in the word He used for it. It
 is the rule or reign of God.

(c). It was pointed out in our discussion of the history
 of the kingdom idea that God's rule over men was a pre-
 dominant element in the conception from the very beginning;
 consequently, as Beyschlag said in the passage quoted, "He
 "was conscious of meaning the same thing as His hearers."
 Yet there is a vast difference between Jesus' understanding
 of the meaning of the 'rule of God' and other prevailing
 conceptions.

(1). In the first place, He differs from contemporary
 ideas in His conception of the sphere in which God is to
 rule. The Jews were expecting God to rule them as a King
 - externally, politically. Jesus taught that the sphere
 of God's rule is in the heart - "The kingdom of God is
 "within you" (Lk.17:21). The verses which picture the
 Son of man as coming in an external form on the clouds of
 heaven do not contradict this idea; for, although the rule

 1. James Moffatt, 'The Theology of the Gospels', p.62.

is spiritual, yet those ruled are real persons living and acting in an external physical world, and this society of men has at its head a real person - the Son of man.

(2). Again, Jesus differs from His contemporaries in His idea of what the rule of God is to displace. The conception suggests the possibility of the rule of others than God. The Jews, because they thought of the kingdom as political and external, contrasted God's rule with that of their enemies. They felt keenly their oppression by the nations round about them, and they believed that when God's rule was established the rule of their oppressors would be overthrown. In the "day of Yahweh," God would utterly destroy His enemies. Jesus, on the other hand, because He believes the sphere of God's rule to be in the heart, contrasts that rule with the reign of such influences and forces as work in the inner life. These forces, as we have seen, are of two kinds - a man's lower self and external evil spirits acting on the inner man through other channels than the senses. The latter is the outstanding one in the thought of Jesus. He frequently contrasts the kingdom of God with the rule of Satan. Manson says that in Matt.12:28, Lk.11:20 "The thought is that the kingdom of God and the dominion of Satan are absolute alternatives,

"and that where the one is driven back the other comes."¹
 J.G. Simpson expresses the same idea: "Over against the
 "kingdom of God was the kingdom of Satan. The drama of
 "human life was accomplished in the presence of this al-
 "ready existing dualism."²

This idea was mentioned in our chapter on the psychology of man, but it needs to be emphasized here because of its importance for an understanding of the teaching of Jesus. In his unredeemed state, man is under the dominion of Satan, and all the effects of sin are due indirectly to his evil rule. In his redeemed state, he is under the rule of God, and all the blessings of salvation are the natural result of this rule. Every mention of the kingdom or rule of God in the gospels implies this contrast. If the evils of man's present sinful condition are due to the rule of Satan, it is natural and inevitable that salvation from these evils should be thought of as resulting from the establishment of the rule of God (Matt.12:28).

(3). A third point of contrast between Jesus' conception of the rule of God and that of His contemporaries is in its method. According to prevailing ideas, when God

1. Wm. Manson, "Christ's View of the Kingdom of God", p.84.
 2. J.G. Simpson, Article 'Sin', D.C.G. Vol.II, p.630.

set up His kingdom He would rule it by force; Jesus teaches that God rules by love. These opposing ideas are in harmony with the conceptions of which they were a part. When the rule of God is thought of as external and political and is contrasted with the rule of Babylon, Greece, or Rome, it is natural to think of it being established by force; but when it is conceived of as having its seat in the heart, and being dependent upon the consent of man, it is natural that its method should be love. Thus in the story of the prodigal son, the Father makes no effort to force his son to do his bidding, but when the son, constrained by his own need and his father's love, returns home, it is presumed that he subjects himself to his father's will because of their mutual love (Lk.15:11-32).

(4). There is one point on which Jesus and His contemporaries are agreed. They all believe that when the kingdom of God should be established, it will be by the act of God, that is, it is to be God's gift. They differ regarding what man can do to receive the gift, but they recognize that no man can enjoy the kingdom and its blessings until God sees fit to bestow it. Thus Jesus teaches His disciples to pray for its coming (Matt.6:10); He pre-

dicts that it will be taken from the Jews and given to those bringing forth the proper fruits (Matt.21:43); He tells the faithful not to be afraid for it is the Father's pleasure to give them the kingdom (Lk.12:32); and He compares it to a seed cast into the ground that grows quietly and mysteriously while man sleeps (Mark 4:26-27).

(5). Finally, Jesus differs from His contemporaries in His conception of the type of the salvation that the kingdom is to offer. We have pointed out that a man's idea of salvation depends upon his view regarding the things from which he needs to be saved. The chief evils from which the Jews felt the need of deliverance were social, economic, and political, rather than religious. They resented the attitude of superiority taken toward them by the nations which successively became their conquerors; they felt keenly the hardship and the poverty which the masses of the people were forced to bear; and they rebelled against the indignity involved in being ruled by foreign powers and paying the tribute which was levied. Like some extreme socialists of to-day who seem to think that most of the evils of modern civilization are due to economic inequality, many of the Jews also attributed the evils

of their times to a single cause - the undesirable political conditions under which they lived. It was this fact which led them to think of the kingdom of God as external and political. Inasmuch as they believed the cause of their unhappy conditions to be essentially political, it was natural that they should think that the only satisfactory remedy for these conditions must also be political. Thus we find that the Fourth Gospel pictures the Jews as seeking to use force in making Jesus their earthly king (Jn.6:15), and even His own disciples held political ideas regarding the character of the kingdom (Mk.10:37).

On the other hand, as we have seen, Jesus believes that the chief cause of human ills is sin. The evils accompanying the rule of Satan in the hearts of men are nearly all the results of sinfulness. Because this is true, the salvation offered under the rule of God is the kind of salvation that such evils require. The truth of this claim will become evident as we study the details of this salvation in the next section of the present chapter.

In the light of the above discussion, it is not surprising that the Jews refuse to accept Jesus as the Messiah. The salvation which He offers simply does not correspond to the type which they conceive to be necessary

for their needs.¹ We shall endeavor to show that the salvation of the kingdom of God actually was (and still is) adequate to meet all the needs of the world, but it is not difficult to understand why the Jews did not recognize this fact.

IV. The Salvation of the Kingdom of God.

(A). Salvation and God.

In the first place, in accord with the principle that the idea of salvation must correspond to the conception of the evils from which man needs to be saved, Jesus teaches that when the kingdom of God is established in a man's heart the disastrous effects of sin on his relationship with God will be removed.

(a). The first of these effects is, as we have seen, that sin grieves the heart of God; it offends His Fatherlove. The proper salvation from such an evil is that God's heart should be made glad by the knowledge that the sinner truly repents and is sorry for his sins. We shall see in the next chapter that man cannot have the rule of God in his heart without repentance; consequently the establishment of God's rule always removes the offense of sin.

1. See Beyschlag, 'New Testament Theology', p.47.

Thus Jesus definitely states that repentance gladdens the heart of God: "There shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons, which need no repentance" (Lk.15:7). In fact, all the parables of the fifteenth chapter of Luke teach this lesson.

(b). The second effect of sin on man's relationship to God is, as we pointed out, that it brings about an estrangement between man and God. To be saved from such an evil requires two things - that a reconciliation shall be effected and that permanent fellowship and communion shall be established. Again, the parables of the fifteenth chapter of Luke are the best source for Jesus' teaching on the point. The sinner is compared to the coin that is lost from the purse, the sheep that has strayed from the fold, and the son who has gone into a far country. God is represented by the woman that "seeks diligently", the anxious shepherd, and the long-suffering father. The solution of the various problems is afforded by the return of the coin to the purse, the sheep to its fold, and the wayward son to his father's house where, after complete reconciliation, he remains in fellowship and communion with his father. There can be little doubt that Jesus means this to be a

picture of the blessings offered to those who permit God to set up His kingdom in their hearts.

(c). It was further shown that sin makes a man guilty in God's sight. So long as this guilt remains, the reconciliation and fellowship which we have been discussing is impossible. Forgiveness is necessary. Our previous discussion has shown that when God's rule is established in a man's heart forgiveness is always granted. It is conditioned on man's willingness to forgive those who trespass against him (Matt.6:12,14,15, 18:35, Mk.11:25), but this is not a requirement over and above that which is involved in membership in the kingdom. On the contrary, when the love of God reigns in a man's heart, forgiveness of others is natural and inevitable.

This discussion makes it clear that Jesus believes that the rule of God in the heart removes all the undesirable effects of sin on man's relationship with God. The pain which sin causes in the heart of God is removed; man's guilt is forgiven; and man and God are reconciled, and live in communion and fellowship.

(B). Salvation and Satan.

In our chapter on psychology, it was shown that Jesus teaches that the personality of man is open to ex-

ternal spiritual influences acting through other channels than the sense organs, and that He believes that Satan and his demons can work in the inner man tempting him to sin and producing disease. In the same way, He believes that, when the kingdom of God is established, the Spirit of God working in a man's heart can overcome temptation and cure disease.

(a). He does not hold that the establishment of the rule of God in a man's heart will relieve him from all temptation. He Himself was frequently tempted, and He recognizes the temptation of others by teaching His disciples to pray for deliverance (Matt.16:23, 6:13); yet He does believe that the establishment of the rule of God will give a man strength to resist temptation. When the heart becomes good, it will be difficult to do anything other than good (Matt.7:18). The love of God in a man's heart will help to keep out temptations. This thought is involved in the story of the unclean spirit that went out of a man and returned to find his 'house' "empty, swept, and garnished" (Matt.12:44). The unclean spirit returns to the man's heart because it is empty. The implication is that if a 'clean' spirit had been dwelling there - that is, if God's rule had been established in the place of the rule

of Satan - the unclean spirit would not have found it so easy to re-enter.

In addition to the above idea, it is probable that Jesus believes that a man's ability to resist temptation is increased by the gift of the Holy Spirit. The presence of the power of the Holy Spirit in a man's heart is an indication that the kingdom of God has been established there (Matt.12:28). Jesus does not describe the exact work of the Holy Spirit (other than that devils are cast out by His power), but there can be little doubt that it includes giving the strength to resist temptation.

(b). Again, as has been suggested, Jesus believes that the establishment of the kingdom or rule of God in a man's heart may result in curing his physical ills and giving him health. He does not tell us how this is to be accomplished, but He assumes it as a fact, and, unless we are disposed to reject many of His best attested miracles, He Himself effects such cures in individual cases. But whatever be the secret of these great miracles, the idea is the complement of the conception that evil spirits, by their access to the inner man, can produce disease. That is, Satan's rule in a man's heart may produce disease, whereas the rule of God can save a man from the evil effects of

the rule of Satan by healing the disease. It has been shown that Jesus does not say that all disease is caused by Satan, but He does seem to assume that, when the kingdom of God is established in a man's heart, God's power is sufficient to cure all his physical ills. In fact He suggests that the cure of such ills is a proof that the kingdom has been established (Lk.7:22). The scope of this power to heal is indicated by Mark when he tells of the sick being brought to Jesus seeking to touch the hem of His garment and he says that "as many as touched Him "were made whole".(Mk.6:56).

In this scientific age, we are disposed to question all physical miracles. We may repudiate them outright, or we may grant their possibility in a past age if they are said to be performed by such a marvellous personality as Jesus. Whatever our opinions may be, however, Jesus seems to believe that what we call miracles can be performed, not only by Himself, but by any man. The power cannot be monopolized by an individual; it is available for all. This power is the Spirit of God. When the rule of God is established in a man's heart, the power of God's Spirit can cure, not only the ills caused by the rule of Satan, but all physical ills.

(c). The effect of the work of Satan, as discussed in the two preceding points, is sometimes spoken of as bondage. A woman is said to have been bound by Satan eighteen years (Lk.13:16). When thought of in such terms, salvation involves release from such bondage, that is freedom; thus the woman is said to have been "loosed" from her "bond".

It is clear then that not only does the establishment of the rule of God in a man's heart remove all the undesirable effects of sin on his relationship with God, but it also counteracts the evils caused by the rule of Satan. That is, it gives a man power to resist temptation; it cures (or at least makes available the power to cure) the physical ills caused by Satan (and other ills as well); and, when the effect of the work of Satan is regarded as bondage, it makes a man free.

(C). Salvation and One's Fellow Men.

In our discussion of the Jewish conception of the need of salvation, it was pointed out that they believed the source of most of their evils to be political; consequently they expected that the salvation which the kingdom of God would bring them would be of the same character. They felt that the economic poverty, social indignity, and

political bondage inflicted upon them by their unsatisfactory relations with surrounding nations could be remedied only by the establishment of a rule of God that was external and political.

On the other hand, it was pointed out in our discussion of the effects of sin on man's relations with his fellow men that Jesus believes sin to be the cause of strife, discord, and other unsatisfactory relations between man and man. Because this is true, He seems to have had little faith in any kind of a political solution for the problems of His day. So long as men's hearts are sinful, it makes little difference whether Rome controls Jerusalem or Jerusalem rules Rome. In either case, the great economic, social, and political problems which vex and perplex men and produce poverty, injustice, and ill will, remain the same. The only real cure for these evils is to strike them at their root - the sin and evil in the hearts of men. If the rule of God is set up in the human heart, all the economic, social, and political problems, or at least those which cause extreme poverty, ill-will, and discord, will be solved.

(a). In the first place, Jesus thinks of the kingdom of God as offering men salvation from economic poverty. He

believes that there is plenty of good things in the world for all. The God who clothes the grass of the field and provides for the sparrow has not failed to fill the world with material blessings sufficient for His children's needs (Matt.6:25-30). If this be true, poverty is caused by improper distribution. Some have more than they need, whereas others are destitute. The great evil is selfishness and greed rather than the lack of enough of this world's goods to supply the needs of everyone. But if the rule of God is established in the hearts of men, if men do unto others as they would have others do unto them, if love and good will replace greed and selfishness, poverty will cease; for those who have plenty will give to those who ask them and lend to those who desire to borrow (Matt.7:12, 5:42). No one will store up useless treasure on the earth, and no one will lack what he needs (Matt.6:19,25). It is true that such a solution of the problem of poverty could not prove universally successful until God rules in the hearts of all men; but it will be progressively approximated as the kingdom of God develops, and it is the only solution that has a possibility of ultimate and complete success.

(b). Again, as was suggested, Jesus believes that the kingdom of God offers to men salvation from the more strict-

ly social evils of life - that is, those which arise out of differences of race, nationality, tradition, training, and sex. He does not believe that these things are really causes of evil in themselves, but merely serve as occasions for its expression. If the rule of God is established in the hearts of men, these evils will disappear. When men love their neighbors as themselves, the Jew can no longer hate the Samaritan, the Greek, or the Roman, or be hated by them; wars will cease; class pride and arrogance will come to an end; and there will no longer be any need for divorce. Love and good-will will be universal, and all the social evils of mankind will be dissolved in a beautiful fellowship of man with man and man with God.

That Jesus does not expect this ideal to be attained at once is indicated by the fact that He speaks of men being persecuted for righteousness' sake (Matt.5:10), He does, however, believe that it is the only ultimate solution of social problems, and that it will be approached as the kingdom progresses.

(c). Thirdly, Jesus believes that the enthronement of God's love in the human heart will solve the political, as well as the economic and social, problems of men. How to free the country from the Romans was the pressing political

problem for the Jews of Jesus' day. Their presence was exceedingly irksome; their sentinels walked the streets and patrolled the highways; their soldiers were quartered in the best buildings of the cities; and tax-gatherers, bearing Roman commissions, exacted every penny they could get from the people. Such a situation seemed to demand immediate relief; no wonder the Jews sought a political Messiah who would be a military genius. Yet, undesirable as conditions are, Jesus recognizes that any attempt to relieve them by force will merely aggravate them. The only permanent solution is to remove their cause - the unloving, unbrotherly attitude in the hearts of men. It is a slow method, perhaps, but the only one that can really succeed; for Jesus recognizes that the only conquest worth while is the conquest of love.

The wisdom of Jesus' method is shown by the fact that, whereas the resistance of the Jews to the Roman power resulted in the destruction of Jerusalem in less than a century after the time of Christ (66-70 A.D.), the powerful influence of brotherly love had made such progress by 325 A.D. that Constantine became the first Christian emperor of the Romans.

We see then that Jesus believes that the estab-

lishment of the kingdom of God in a man's heart will not only put him right with God and free him from the evil effects of Satan's rule, but it will also ultimately solve all the complex social problems of life.

(D). Salvation and Self.

It was pointed out in our discussion of the effects of sin that Jesus places His greatest emphasis upon the influence of sin on the man himself. Because this is true, we are prepared to expect that the chief benefits of the rule of God will be enjoyed by the individual in whose heart He rules. The salvation of the kingdom is not essentially national, as the Jews expected it to be, but individual. Not individual in the sense of being anti-social, but in the sense that any man may enjoy most of its benefits even if all other men refuse them.

We have seen that sin produces disastrous effects on a man's life both in this world and in that which is to come. In response to the need thus created, Jesus teaches that the kingdom of God offers a man both a present and a future salvation; and, inasmuch as the effect of sin is both physical and moral, the salvation offered by the kingdom is of a similar character. Moreover, since the natural man, even without sin, is not perfect, the rule of God

enables him to progress toward intellectual and spiritual perfection.

(a). The Benefits which the Kingdom of God Bestows on the Individual in the Present Life.

(1). As we have seen, the physical effect of the rule of God in a man's heart is to produce health. Physical disease may actually be cured, and, presumably, premature death prevented. The power of the kingdom to cure disease has been discussed, and no further consideration is necessary. As to the prevention of death, Jesus does not teach that sin is the cause of all physical death, so He does not promise that the rule of God in a man's heart will prevent him from dying. It is possible that at one period in His ministry He hopes that the kingdom may be consummated by His personal return in glory before some members of His own generation die (Matt.16:28), but there is no indication that He expects to prevent physical death altogether. Although He sometimes raises the dead, He does not regard death as a great evil (Lk.7:11-15). The son of the widow of Nain is raised for his mother's sake, not his own. Jesus "had compassion on her." Death is included in the plan of God for human life, but it is only a passing phase; it is to be followed by a resurrection (Matt.22:31-32, Mk. 12:25-27, Lk.20:35-36).

(2). The rule of God in a man's heart offers intellectual benefits also. Although, as we have seen, Jesus does not think of ignorance as a sin, yet He does recognize it as an evil. There is no suggestion that man needs to be omniscient; but some knowledge is necessary to his well-being, and Jesus seems to believe that at least a part of this necessary knowledge will become available through the rule of God in his heart.

a. First, he knows God. Jesus had come to reveal God to men. He pictures Him as a God of love, and teaches men to speak of Him as 'Father' (Matt.6:9). He is perfect (Matt.5:48). a giver of all things needful (Matt.6:8,32), and one who forgives those who are willing to forgive others (Matt.6:12, Mk.11:25-26). He cares for the sparrow and the lily (Matt.6:28, 10:29); He is kind unto the unthankful and the evil (Lk.6:35-36); and sends rain on the just and the unjust (Matt.5:45). These are only a few of the things that Jesus teaches about God.

b. Again, the members of the kingdom will be initiated into the mysteries of the kingdom (Mk.4:11, Matt.13:11, Lk.8:10). This privilege is to be theirs exclusively, for to others "it is not given". Just what these mysteries are, is not stated. W.C. Allen says: "The represen-

"tation of eschatological ideas, immortality of the soul, resurrection of the body, future judgment, Messianic kingdom as 'secrets' revealed to the elect, is especially characteristic of apocalyptic and Sibylline literature, and the word in this sense has been adopted by New Testament writers." ¹ It is likely that Jesus has things of this type in mind when He speaks of the members of the kingdom understanding the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but, whatever these mysteries may have been, there can be no doubt that He regards them as a kind of Divine knowledge. Those who become members of the kingdom will, to some extent, participate with God in His Divine plans and purposes.

It is difficult to draw the line between the knowledge which is necessary before the rule of God is established in the heart and the knowledge which results from that rule. When our study of the salvation of the kingdom is completed, however, it will be obvious that the experience of fellowship and communion with God and one's fellow men, as well as of peace and harmony in one's own soul, is certain to give a man an experimental knowledge of Divine things that would not be possible for him otherwise.

(3). Although Jesus teaches that the kingdom of God

1. Int. Crit. Commentary, St. Matthew, p.144.

offers a man salvation in this life from his physical and intellectual evils, yet its chief benefits are moral and spiritual. We have shown that it puts a man right with God and his fellow men, but it remains to point out that it gives him peace within his own soul. Our study of the effects of sin on a man's moral life has made it clear that sin corrupts the character, enslaves the will, sets up conflict and discord in the heart, and causes great discontent and unhappiness. To be saved from such a state means that character must be made good, the will set free to choose the right, the various elements of personality brought into harmony, and joy and happiness produced.

The 'New Psychology' teaches theories about the personality of man that are a valuable aid to an understanding of Jesus' teaching on salvation.¹ This school contends that a man is a "bundle of instincts", and that each of these instincts is of such character that it must have expression. If expression is not given, the energy of the instinct accumulates, and eventually bursts out in undesirable ways. In the course of life, the cognitive and affective aspects of the instincts become organized

1. The chief sources for the psychological ideas used here are McDougall, Tansley, Hadfield, Barry, and Pym. See Bibliography.

into sentiments or complexes, and these sentiments or complexes may be further organized around ideals. The perfectly 'integrated' personality is one in which all the instincts and sentiments are organized around an ideal big enough to give them a full and harmonious expression.

If this is true, the wholly bad man would be one whose instincts and sentiments were all organized around low ideals, whereas the perfectly good man would be the one whose instincts and sentiments were organized around the highest possible ideal. In actual life, however, the ordinary person's instincts and sentiments are organized around several ideals, some high and some low, with no harmony between them. The result is inner discord and unhappiness. If the lower ideals are the stronger, the character will be predominantly bad; if the higher prevail, the character will be good. In either case, however, a man cannot be happy until some ideal is found big enough that, when all the instincts are organized around it, they will be given a satisfactory expression. In the light of this discussion, sin means acting in accord with a lower ideal, whereas righteousness is acting in accord with the highest ideal that one knows. Continued sin will strengthen the lower ideal or ideals until it becomes impossible to

do good, and, in the same way, continued righteousness will so strengthen the highest ideal that eventually, like the 'good tree', a man cannot produce evil. The consciousness of guilt is the recognition by the individual that he has acted in accord with a lower ideal when he ought to have acted in harmony with the very highest; and temptation is the attraction of a lower ideal in competition with the highest.

If this analysis be correct, in order for the kingdom of God to save a man from the corruption of character caused by sin, the inner discord produced by temptation and guilt, and the resulting misery and unhappiness, it must offer him an ideal big enough that, when his personality has been organized around it, all his instincts and powers will be given a complete and harmonious expression. In other words, the ideal which the kingdom offers must be such, that, if realized, it would make a man a perfectly integrated personality.

As was pointed out in a previous chapter, Jesus knew nothing about the New Psychology, and yet the New Psychology reveals His marvellous insight into the nature of personality; for the kingdom of God offers to man the perfect ideal around which he may integrate his life. We

have seen that Jesus believes the kingdom of God to be the rule of God in the human heart. But, although Jesus seems to recognize that when a man has opened his heart to God the Spirit of God may work in him independent of his conscious co-operation (Mk.13:11), yet the ordinary way in which God rules is through man's conscious obedience to His will. Man has a very definite ideal to follow, and that ideal is the will of God. As to what the will of God is, Jesus does not attempt to tell us in detail; yet He lays down some general principles which are sufficient for our guidance: He says that men must love God with all their being, and love their neighbors as themselves (Matt. 22:37,39); they are to seek first the rule of God and His righteousness (Matt.6:33); and they are to do unto others as they would have others do unto them (Matt.7:12). The first of these sayings is, perhaps, the best statement of the ideal. No better guiding principle could be found for the life of man than that he should love God with all his heart, soul, strength, and mind, and love his neighbor as himself. Jesus believes this ideal to be big enough to call forth all the energies of man and give his personality a full and complete expression.

a. First, it will change his corrupt character into

a good one. If bad character is the organization of the instincts and sentiments around low ideals, the complete acceptance of the ideal offered by the kingdom of God together with the abandonment of all conflicting ideals cannot result otherwise than in the development of a good character. It is because Jesus recognizes this fact that He insists so emphatically that the kingdom of God must always be made first (Matt.6:33). Other things may be good in themselves, but, if they become ideals to be sought for their own sake, the personality is divided and the character corrupted. No man can serve two masters; consequently, as we have seen, the highest things of this world - money, property, state, home, family, even one's own life must be regarded as of secondary importance in comparison with the ideal of the kingdom. When, however, a man's life has been organized around the perfect ideal of the kingdom, his character becomes good; lower ideals lose much of their attraction; the power of temptation is broken; and sin becomes correspondingly rare. Jesus does not seem to have felt that the salvation of the kingdom is ever so complete that a perfectly integrated personality is produced. In order to have such a personality, it would be necessary for the highest ideal to be so

firmly entrenched that no other would have attraction for a man; consequently he could not be tempted. Even Jesus Himself was not integrated to that extent. The goal for which He hopes is that the personalities of men may be so thoroughly organized around the kingdom of God ideal that, although tempted by lower ideals, they will be able to resist the temptation. In this, we have reason to believe, He set a perfect example by being entirely free from sin.

b. But in order for salvation to be complete, it must not only make the character good, but also give the will unlimited freedom to make right choices. The previous discussion has made it clear that Jesus does not expect that man will attain such freedom. Lower ideals will always retain some attraction for him, and this attraction will limit his power to choose the right. However, as the ideal of the kingdom of God becomes more firmly implanted in his mind, freedom to choose the right will be progressively approximated until man will approach the point where, like the good tree, he "cannot bring forth evil fruit" (Matt.7:18).

c. In the same way Jesus teaches that the salvation of the kingdom will give a man inner peace and harmony.

We have pointed out in our discussion of the effects of sin that the causes of discord in a man's heart are temptation and a consciousness of guilt. But if temptation is the attraction of a lower ideal in competition with a higher one, and the consciousness of guilt is the recognition that one has acted in accord with a lower ideal when he ought to have acted in harmony with the highest, then the complete acceptance of the ideal of the kingdom of God and the organization of the life around it will tend to eliminate both of these evils and remove their effects. The extent to which a man has peace and harmony in his inner life will depend largely upon how completely God rules in his heart. The consciousness of guilt must be removed by the knowledge of forgiveness, but forgiveness once received is not enough. Each succeeding sin will bring its own guilt, and the only hope for permanent peace must come from the feeling that one is earnestly striving after the highest possible ideal, and that God gladly forgives the failures of those who do their best. Since this is true, the complete realization of the ideal of the kingdom of God would give a man perfect peace within his own soul. And even an imperfect realization of this ideal, inasmuch as it reduces the tension caused by a conflict between ideals,

decreases the number of guilt-producing sins, and gives assurance of forgiveness, will bring to a man much of the peace which he desires. This is suggested in the invitation of Jesus to men to come unto Him that He may give them rest (Matt.11:28-30). The words are, "Come unto me
 "all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give
 "you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I
 "am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto
 "your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

W.C. Allen says: "There is throughout this passage an underlying contrast between the Pharisaic conception of religion and the teaching of Christ... The Pharisaic treatment of the law made it a heavy burden; Christ's teaching was a light burden and an easy yoke.... Christ summoned to Him these simple folk groaning beneath the burden of religion as expounded by the Pharisees." If this interpretation be correct, Jesus recognizes that the minds of the common people are troubled because the necessary labors of their everyday lives make it impossible for them to keep a law so complex and intricate that it was a burden even for those who had nothing else to do. There is a conflict of ideals in their minds, and a consciousness of guilt that

1. Int. Crit. Commentary, St. Matthew, p.124.

nothing in the Jewish religion is able to remove. Jesus invites them to give up the hopeless struggle, to accept¹ the great ideal of love that He Himself embodies, and He promises that, if they will do this, their souls will be at peace. Thus it is clear that the salvation which the kingdom of God has to offer, not only produces a good character and makes the will free to choose the right, but it also gives a man peace of heart.

d. Finally, Jesus believes that the acceptance of the kingdom of God ideal and the organization of the life around it will produce joy and happiness.

Psychologically, this is just what we would expect. Hadfield says, "Joy is the affective tone which accompanies the expression of any one instinct in conformity with the sentiments of the self."² "Happiness is

1. The fact that Jesus regards Himself as embodying the ideal of the kingdom suggests a thought of great importance for our study. The struggle between ideals in a man's mind can, and sometimes does, become a contest between loyalty to Christ and loyalty to persons embodying, or, at least, representing lower ideals. For instance, man is seldom called upon to choose between the abstract ideal of the family and the ideal of the kingdom of God, but he may be forced to choose frequently between loyalty to Christ as embodying the kingdom ideal and loyalty to his wife or mother as representing the family ideal. When thought of in these terms, sin is disloyalty to Christ.

2. J.A. Hadfield, 'Psychology and Morals', p.88.

"the feeling tone we experience when all the instinctive¹ emotions are expressed in harmony." If this be true, and if a man accepts the kingdom of God ideal and acts in accord with it, every act will bring him joy, and inasmuch as the kingdom of God ideal is big enough to give all his instinctive emotions harmonious expression, the total result will be happiness. Moreover, the quality of the happiness will depend entirely upon the extent to which he realizes the ideal.

That Jesus expects the rule of God in the hearts of men to result in joy and happiness is indicated by a number of sayings in the Synoptics. In Matthew 25:21,23, the servants who have attained the ideal set for them are told to "enter into the joy" of their lord. In Luke 24:52, after the ascension of Jesus, the disciples return "to Jerusalem with great joy." In Matthew 5:12, men are told to "rejoice and be exceeding glad." Jesus calls His message the "gospel" or the "good news" (Matt.24:14, 26:13, Mk.1:15, 8:35, 10:29, 14:9, 16:15). The beatitudes proclaim the happiness of those who are meek, merciful, pure in heart, etc. These passages leave no room for doubt that the establishment of the kingdom of God in a man's heart produces joy and happiness.

1. J.A. Hadfield, 'Psychology and Morals', p.86.

Thus it is clear that the kingdom of God offers man, not only ideal relations with God and his fellow men, but complete personal salvation in this world. It gives him a good character, a free will, a peaceful heart, and a joyous, happy life.

(b). The Benefits which the Kingdom of God Bestows on the Individual in the Life to Come.

In our study of the effects of sin on the experience of men in the future life, it was shown that Jesus believes sin to result in physical punishment, loss of eternal life and great unhappiness. If the salvation offered by the kingdom of God is to be entirely satisfactory, it must save a man not only from all the evils of this life, but also from those of the world to come. The Synoptics leave no room for doubt that Jesus believes the salvation of the kingdom adequate for this purpose.

(1). In the first place, the members of the kingdom are saved from physical punishment in the future life. This is shown by the fact that there is no suggestion in the Synoptics of physical punishment for the righteous, and, inasmuch as Jesus recognizes that all men are sinners, the righteous are undoubtedly those sinners who have repented and allowed God to establish His rule in their hearts. They are the members of the kingdom of God.

(2). On the other hand, the righteous are promised eternal life. They will "inherit the kingdom prepared" for them "from the foundation of the world" (Matt.25:34). They will enter into "eternal life" (Matt.25:46). Luke quotes Jesus as saying definitely that eternal life is to be the reward of those who willingly sacrifice all other values in life for the kingdom of God's sake: "There is "no man that hath left house, or wife, or brethern, or "parents, or children for the kingdom of God's sake, who "shall not receive manifold more in this time, and in the "world to come eternal life" (Lk.18:29-30). In contrast to the idea that the penalty which the wicked are to suffer is spiritual death, the reward of the righteous is to be life eternal.

(3). Finally, this eternal life is a state of joy and happiness. Men are to rejoice over their reward in heaven (Matt.5:12). Probably both present and future are included in the incident of the righteous servants who are told to enter into the joy of their lord (Matt.25:21,23); and the happiness of the future life is suggested by contrast in the passages where the wicked are pictured as weeping or wailing and gnashing their teeth (Matt.8:12, 13:42-43, 22:13, 24:51, 25:30, Lk.13:28). As has been said,

most of Jesus' language about the future is symbolical, and it is difficult to find specific sayings in support of ideas that are so well authenticated by the general content of His teaching that no one would think of questioning them. The passages mentioned are sufficient, however, to indicate the facts.

Thus it is clear that the kingdom of God offers a man salvation in the future life as well as the present. It frees him from physical punishment, and gives him eternal life and happiness.

Summary:

In this chapter we have treated very briefly the history of the kingdom of God, have studied its meaning, and have shown that it embodies Jesus' view of salvation. We have found that the kingdom idea originated perhaps as early as the eighth century B.C.; and that, although the ideas regarding it were fluid, they always included the conceptions of an ideal future age, an era when God would rule, and a time when Israel or at least the righteous remnant of Israel would be vindicated. We have seen that Jesus accepts the idea that the kingdom is the rule of God, but that He differs from His contemporaries by insisting: that it is internal instead of external; that it is to be

contrasted with the rule of Satan rather than with the rule of Rome; that its method is love rather than force; that it is a gift which man can do nothing to earn, as against the idea that it can be partially merited; and that its essential aim is to save men from the effects of sin rather than from those of political, social, or economic oppression. We have discussed in detail the idea that the kingdom of God embodies Jesus' view of salvation, and have shown that this idea of salvation corresponds in nearly every point with His conception of the things from which man needs to be saved, that is, the effects of sin. In considering the details of this salvation, we have pointed out: that it sets man right with God by effecting a reconciliation between the sinner and God, insuring forgiveness in God's sight, and establishing fellowship and communion; that it undoes the work of Satan by giving man the power to resist temptation, curing the physical ills caused by evil spirits, and breaking the power of Satan over the sinner's life; that it brings man into harmony with his fellow men by offering a solution of his economic, social, and political problems; and finally, that it offers the individual physical, intellectual, and moral and spiritual salvation both in this world and that which is to come.

In the light of this chapter, it is evident that the kingdom of God has great importance in the mind of Jesus. It embodies His conception of the ideal salvation for all the evils of the world. In itself it is merely the rule of God in the human heart, but, if this rule is established in the hearts of all men, it will make this world a veritable Utopia, and insure the blessings of heaven to all.

RECEIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOMI. Introduction.

(a). Statement of problem.

(b). Although the kingdom is a gift of God which cannot be earned or merited in any way, yet the gift must be received. Two things are required in order to receive it: repentance and faith.

(c). Repentance and faith are elements of a state of consciousness, and have the psychological aspects which are characteristic of all states of consciousness.

II. Setting up the Kingdom of God in the Heart.(A). Repentance.

(a). Synoptic evidence that Jesus believes repentance to be necessary before the kingdom can be established in the heart.

(b). The meaning of repentance.

(c). The Psychological Aspects of Repentance.

(1). The cognitive aspect - the recognition of the inadequacy of the ideals which one has been seeking and the sinfulness of seeking them.

(2). The affective aspect - the sorrow which should result from the recognition that the motives which have guided one's conduct are out of harmony with the highest ideal.

(3). The conative aspect - turning from lower ideals or actions and renouncing them.

a. It involves renouncing unconditionally everything which is always out of harmony with the will of God.

b. It involves renouncing conditionally such things as sometimes are and sometimes are not in harmony with God's will. Illustrations of things which Jesus teaches that men must be willing to renounce.

RECEIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOM

1. Earthly life.
2. Comfort and ease.
3. Money and property.
4. Family life.

(d). The power to repent is, in part, a gift of God.

(B). Faith.

(a). The idea of faith in the Synoptics.

(b). The meaning of faith.

(c). The Psychological Aspects of Faith.

- (1) The cognitive aspect - the recognition of the adequacy of the ideal that one is about to seek. It may take the form of faith in the Gospel, faith in Christ, or faith in God.
- (2) The affective aspect - loving and trusting the ideal.

- a. Loving the Gospel.
- b. Loving and trusting Christ and God. The feeling element in trust.

(3) The conative aspect - acting in accord with one's knowledge, trust, and love.

- a. Opening one's heart to the Spirit of God.
- b. Organizing one's life around the ideal of the kingdom.
- c. Following Christ.
- d. The act of trusting God as contrasted with the mere feeling of trust.

(d). Faith like repentance is, in part, a gift of God.

III. Growth in Grace.

(A). Repentance and faith are never completed in this life; consequently God's rule is never entirely established in a man's heart. Growth in grace is necessary. The process is called sanctification.

RECEIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOM(B). Things which Man Can Do to Aid God in the Work of Sanctification.

- (a). Confess his sin and acknowledge Christ before men.
- (b). Submit to baptism.
- (c). Observe the Lord's Supper.
- (d). Pray.

Summary.

CHAPTER IX

RECEIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOMI. Introduction.

(a). Having completed our study of the natural man, the natural man corrupted by sin, and the salvation offered by the kingdom of God, the next step in the consideration of Jesus' conception of man as a religious being is to inquire how he is to appropriate salvation. The present chapter will examine Jesus' teaching regarding what man may do to receive it, whereas the chapter which follows will be concerned with what God does to bestow it.

(b). In studying what man can do to receive the salvation of the kingdom, we should keep in mind the things which have been said about the kingdom being a gift of God.

It is not something which a man can earn, and there are no 'entrance requirements' in the sense that a man must attain a certain standard of virtue before he can be admitted into it. As Professor Mackintosh has said: "We cannot - this is the outcome of the whole - we cannot put God under an obligation or establish a claim against Him which He has no choice but to acknowledge; ultimately, whatever our record, we owe everything to His loving kindness." The kingdom of God is a gift which God bestows without reference to the righteousness of men. The greatest sinners may receive it as readily as the most righteous Pharisees.

Nevertheless, in another sense there are entrance requirements for the kingdom. It is a gift, but the gift must be received. It is like the sun which shines on all alike, but if a man wishes it to shine into his home, he must open the doors and throw wide the shutters. When the doors and windows are open, the sun shines in. It is entirely indifferent as to how the house is furnished. It may be a gorgeous mansion or a miserable hovel; the sun does not stop to inquire; it shines on all alike. In the same way, God offers the gift of the kingdom to all. The

1. H.R. Mackintosh, 'The Christian Experience of Forgiveness', p.110.

only condition being that man must open the doors and windows of his heart to receive it. This condition, however, is not so easy as one might suppose. Jesus believes that the establishment of the rule of God in a man's heart requires two things - repentance and faith (Mk.1:15). He must cast off the old life and receive the new. We shall consider these two ideas separately.

(c). Modern psychology teaches that every state of consciousness has three aspects - a cognitive, an affective, and a conative. Repentance and faith are states of consciousness, or, at least, two elements of a state of consciousness; consequently, although Jesus never speaks of aspects of consciousness, yet we shall find these ideas to have value for the study of His teaching.

II. Setting up the Kingdom of God in the Heart.

(A). Repentance.

(a). As suggested above, the first requirement for receiving the kingdom of God is repentance. Both Jesus and John the Baptist begin their ministries with a call to repent (Matt.3:2, 4:17, Mk.1:15). When the twelve are sent out to preach, their message is "that men should repent" (Mk.6:12). Jesus upbraids "the cities wherein most of His "mighty works were done, because they repented not" (Matt.

11:20). The men of Ninevah condemn the generation in which Jesus lives because of its failure to repent (Matt.12:41). And finally, Jesus declares that one of His purposes in coming to the world is to call "sinners to repentance." These passages, and others which might be added, make it clear that He believed repentance to be necessary before the rule of God could be established in a man's heart.

(b). The meaning of repentance is suggested by the Greek word which is used for it - 'Metanoia' (μετάνοια). The word means change of mind. Repentance is the changing of one's mind, or, in the light of the discussion of the previous chapter, it is the first step in the transference of one's loyalty from a lower to the highest ideal. Although we are discussing repentance and faith separately, yet, as was suggested above, they are not two entirely different things. Repentance is the negative side of the state of mind of which faith is the positive.

(c). The Psychological Aspects of Repentance.

(1). The cognitive aspect of repentance is the recognition of the inadequacy of the ideals which one has been seeking, and the consequent sinfulness of seeking them. Because this is true, before a man can repent he must be led to understand that his conduct is wrong and that a better

course of action is available. It is conceivable that a man might repent for certain deeds which he thought to be wrong, when, as a matter of fact, they were right; but no man can repent until he believes that his conduct is sinful. Jesus recognizes this point when He says that if Tyre and Sidon had witnessed the mighty works done in Bethsaida and Chorazin "they would have repented long ago in "sackcloth and ashes." (Matt.11:21, Lk.10:13). Without the knowledge that their works were wrong, they could not repent. The intellectual element is absolutely essential.

(2). The affective aspect of repentance is the sorrow which should result from the recognition that the motives which have guided one's conduct are out of harmony with the highest ideal. As was pointed out in a note in the last chapter, ideals sometimes become embodied in persons or represent persons; thus the kingdom of God ideal was embodied in Christ and represents God because it is the will of God. When a man recognizes this fact, he may think of his failure to act in accord with the ideal of the kingdom as a personal offense against God or disloyalty to Christ. In this case, his sorrow will be much greater than if he recognizes merely that he has not acted in accord with the highest abstract ideal. The strength of Christianity is

largely due to the fact that men are impelled to do right by a personal loyalty to Christ and a feeling that sin is an offense against God,

Perhaps the best illustration of Jesus' recognition of the affective element in repentance is in the story of the two men who went up into the temple to pray. "The publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes to heaven, but smote his breast, saying, "God, be merciful to me a sinner" (Lk.18:13). The publican is conscious of his guilt and truly sorry for it, and his sorrow is increased by the fact that he feels his sin to be an offense against God. Another illustration of the same idea is given in the incident of the sinful woman who wet the feet of Jesus with her tears and wiped them with her hair (Lk.7:38). Jesus finds the motive for her great sorrow over her sins in the fact that she "loved much" (Lk. 7:47). Her repentance involves sorrow and the sorrow is greatly intensified by the knowledge that her sins are displeasing to Jesus.

(3). When a man has recognized that an ideal is wrong and is sorry that he has acted in accord with it, one further element is necessary to complete his repentance: he must turn from the ideal or renounce it. The conative

element in repentance is the renunciation of acts or ideals that are out of harmony with the highest that one knows. In the teaching of Jesus, it is the giving up of everything that interferes with the rule of God in the heart. This renunciation is of two types: it is complete in the case of acts or ideals which are always out of harmony with the kingdom of God, and conditional in the case of things which sometimes are and sometimes are not in harmony with the kingdom ideal. To repent is to give up or to be willing to give up everything for the kingdom of God's sake. It is "like unto a man that is a merchant seeking goodly pearls: And having found one pearl of great price, he went and sold all that he had, and bought it" (Matt.13:45-46). So a man must be willing to sacrifice all that he has for the kingdom.

a. First, as was suggested above, he must renounce unconditionally everything that is always out of harmony with the kingdom. We cannot doubt that these things include such sins as Jesus has listed in Mark 7:21-22: "evil thoughts ... fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness." These sins are the fruits of the rule of Satan, and must be completely re-

nounced before God can rule in the heart. In psychological terms, they always represent adherence to lower ideals, and must be abandoned before the personality can be integrated around the kingdom of God ideal.

b. The things which must be conditionally renounced in order that a man may truly repent are those which are good in themselves but which sometimes conflict with the highest of all goods - the ideal of the kingdom. A number of things of this type were mentioned in our discussion of the external limitations of moral freedom. Jesus recognizes that there are things in this world that have a positive value, and, under ordinary circumstances, are worth seeking for their own sake; yet when loyalty to them conflicts with loyalty to the kingdom of God, they must be given up. This point is well attested in the gospels.

1. In the first place, Jesus teaches that a man must be willing to give up "the highest of earthly goods,¹ "viz, the earthly life" for the sake of the kingdom. "Whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it" (Mk.8:35). No one would suppose that Jesus

1. H.H. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol.II, p.59.

Wendt gives an excellent discussion of repentance.

believed that every member of the kingdom must die a violent death, but He does insist that each shall hold his life cheaply in comparison to the interests of the kingdom, and be ready to die if such a sacrifice be required.

2. Again, men must be willing to surrender their earthly comfort and ease. The disciples are asked to leave their homes and become the companions of one who did not have so much as a place to lay His head (Mk.10:28, Lk. 9:58); and they are told that they will suffer affliction and persecution, be delivered up to the synagogues, and put in prison for Christ's sake (Matt.5:11,44, 10:23, 13:21, Mk.4:17). Although Jesus insists that men should be willing to renounce these things and that, in some cases, they will be called upon to do so, yet He does not hold that such renunciation is always necessary. He Himself was not an ascetic about eating and drinking, and His disciples frequently enjoyed with Him the hospitality offered by their mutual friends (Matt.11:19, Mk.14:3, Lk.7:34).

3. Jesus' teaching about the use of money or property is a third illustration of this point. It is foolish to lay up treasures on the earth (Matt.6:19, Lk.12:16-21), and to trust in riches (Mk.10:23-24, Lk.18:24). The young ruler, whose property is a stumbling block to him is

told to sell all that he has and give the money to the poor (Matt.19:21). If money becomes an end in itself it is an evil to be avoided, but Jesus did not believe that money was always an evil. He Himself used it and allowed others to use it in His behalf: He commends the payment of taxes to the government (Matt.22:21, Mk.12:17, Lk.20:25); He asks Peter to give tribute money for "Me and thee" (Matt. 17:27); and He allows certain women to minister to Him of "their substance" (Lk.8:3).

4. Finally, there are a number of sayings which show that, although Jesus believes family life to be a good thing in itself, yet a man must be willing to renounce all family ties for the sake of the kingdom. Thus He speaks of those who have "made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom¹ of heaven's sake" (Matt.19:12). He says, "If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple" (Lk.14:26). Matthew 10:35-37 and Luke 9:59-62 also involve this idea. But, although men must be willing to renounce their family ties, yet such renunciation is seldom required. Jesus

1. Wendt says that this means the "voluntary renunciation of marriage"- 'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol.II, p.73.

treats His mother and brethren with respect, while, at the same time, He makes it clear that in His own mind the interests of the kingdom of God take precedence over the relations of the family (Mk.3:32-35, Lk.8:20-21). Peter seems to have had a wife and a mother-in-law, and, although it is probable that in following Jesus he was kept away from his family much of the time, yet there is no suggestion that he was ever told to renounce them entirely (Matt.8:14, Mk.1:30, Lk.4:38).

We see then that Jesus believed repentance to involve these three aspects; first, it is the recognition of the inadequacy of the lower ideals that one has been following and the sinfulness of following them; second, it is the sorrow that results from such recognition especially when the sin committed is thought of as disloyalty to Christ or an offense against God; and third, it is the renunciation of all the ideals and actions resulting from them which are out of harmony with the ideal of the kingdom - the will of God.

(d). One other fact in Jesus' teaching about repentance must not be neglected. It has been said that the kingdom of God and the salvation which it offers are gifts from God, and that it is man's part to receive them through repentance and faith. But repentance and faith are not easy for men.

Some of the difficulties involved in the former have been suggested by our study. It is impossible for a man to so control the desires of his heart that by his own power he can renounce all the evil habits of the past, the property which, perhaps, he has spent the greater part of his life in acquiring, his loved ones dearer to him than his own soul, and even life itself. The disciples realize this fact when Jesus speaks of the difficulties which rich men must face in entering the kingdom of God, and they cry out in despair, "Then who can be saved?" (Mk.10:26, Matt.19:25, Lk.18:26). Jesus does not minimize the difficulty, but replies that, although it is impossible with man, it is not with God. Thus Jesus teaches not only that the kingdom is a gift of God, but also that the repentance and faith necessary to receive it are, in part, gifts of God. We must be willing to repent and believe, but we cannot do so¹ without God's help.

(B). Faith.

(a). The second requirement for receiving the kingdom of God is faith. The idea either in the form of the verb πιστεύω or the noun πίστις occurs frequently in the Synoptics.

The call which Jesus issues at the beginning of His ministry

1. See B. Weiss, 'Biblical Theology of the New Testament', Vol.I, p.97.

is not merely to repent, but "to believe the gospel" (Mk. 1:15); and throughout His teaching He frequently speaks of 'faith'. Men are admitted to the blessings of the kingdom because of their faith (Matt. 8:10, 13, 9:2, 22, 29, 15:28. Mk. 5:34, 10:52, Lk. 7:50, 8:48), and they are denied these blessings because of their lack of faith (Matt. 13:58). It is evident that faith is necessary before God's rule can be established in the heart.

(b). The meaning of faith was suggested above. It is the positive aspect of the state of consciousness of which repentance is the negative. If repentance is the casting aside of all that ^{is} out of harmony with the kingdom of God, faith is the whole-hearted acceptance of the kingdom and all that it involves. Thus Professor Seeley says, "He, who, when goodness is impressively put before him, exhibits an instinctive loyalty to it, starts forward ^{to} take its side, trusts ~~himself~~ ¹ to it, such a man has faith." This definition suggests the three aspects involved in all faith: men must recognize good when they see it; they must love it, and, when it is personified, have a feeling of trust toward the person who personifies it; and finally, they must act in accord with their knowledge, love, and trust.

1. J.R. Seeley, 'Ecce Homo', p.66.

(c). The Psychological Aspects of Faith.

(1). As was suggested above, the cognitive aspect of faith is the recognition of good when it is seen. If the cognitive aspect of repentance is the recognition of the inadequacy of the lower ideals that one has been seeking, the cognitive aspect of faith is the realization of the adequacy of the ideal that one is about to seek. In the teaching of Jesus, the ideal which is the object of faith is thought of in three ways: when it is an ethical abstraction, men are to have faith in the Gospel; when it is embodied in Christ, they are to have faith in Him; when it is conceived of as the will of God, they are to have faith in God. Because this is true, the cognitive aspect of faith may involve the recognition of any one of the three as the ideal around which one must organize his life. Thus we find Jesus urging men to "believe in the gospel" (Mk.1:15), calling those who accept the word which is sown in their hearts "good ground" (Mk.4:20), and prophesying that, although heaven and earth will pass away, yet His "word" will never pass away (Mk.13:31). There is an inherent value in the "gospel" or His "word" that must be recognized before men can be saved. In the same way, they must realize that He is the embodiment of the perfect ideal; they must accept Him. He says,

"Come unto me and I will give you rest" (Matt.11:28-30); He invites men to take up their crosses and follow Him (Matt.16:24, Mk.8:34, Lk.9:23); and He regards the rejection of Himself as equivalent to the rejection of His message (Lk.13:34). Finally, the cognitive aspect of faith may involve the recognition that the perfect ideal of life which one contemplates accepting is the will of God, and therefore that God is the heavenly personification of this ideal. Thus Jesus does not teach ethics only, but He teaches a great deal about God and urges men to have faith in God (Mk.11:22).

(2). As suggested above, when the new ideal has been recognized either in the abstract form of the Gospel or in its personified form in God or Christ, the affective aspect of faith involves loving and trusting it. It is the feeling element necessary before man can open his heart to allow God to set up His kingdom there. Jesus recognizes this element in faith in His teaching with reference to all three forms of the ideal.

a. In the first place, He recognizes that there ought to be feeling connected with the reception of the Gospel. The word 'gospel' means good news, and it cannot be doubted that the manner in which it ought to be received

is contemplated in the use of such a word. In the parable of the sower, He speaks in a tone of commendation of those who receive the word "with joy" (Mk.4:16). If the faith of men be real, they will joyfully receive the ideal offered by the kingdom; they will love goodness because it is good.

b. In the same way, when the ideal of the kingdom is personified, faith involves loving and trusting the person in whom this personification has taken place. Thus, in order to have faith, one must love and trust both Christ and God. We shall see that there is a conative as well as an affective element in trust. The affective element, however, is a feeling that the one trusted can be relied on - that it is safe to put complete dependence in him. To have faith in Christ or in God then means that a man must love and trust Them, and feel that he is safe in surrendering himself completely to Them. There are a number of passages in the teaching of Jesus that suggest this idea, but perhaps the best description of the personal side of the affective aspect of faith is in His reference to a little child as a model for those who are to be admitted into the kingdom of God. He says: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no

"wise enter therein" (Mk.10:15, Lk.18:17). The child loves his parents, and trusts them implicitly; he has such confidence in them that he takes it for granted that they will protect him, supply his wants, and give him the loving companionship which he desires. The cognitive side of the child's faith may be weak, but its affective side is strong. So Jesus suggests that if men are to enter into the kingdom of God, they must accept it in a child-like way, and, inasmuch as both He and His Father personify the ideal of the kingdom, both must be the object of the child-like love and trust of men.

(3). When the object of faith, whether abstract or personal, has been recognized, and a man's appreciation of it is sufficient to lead him to love it and trust in it, one further element is necessary to complete his faith: he must act in accord with his knowledge, trust, and love. This is its conative aspect. The action required may be described in four ways:

a. First, when thought of in the light of Jesus' conception of psychology, faith involves the opening of the heart to God so that His Spirit may enter in and dwell there in place of evil spirits. The sphere of the kingdom of God is in a man's heart, but God cannot rule there until a man

opens the doors of his heart and allows Him to enter and take possession. Thus, M. Scott Fletcher says, "The personal act of completely surrendering the inmost citadel of personality to God's saving and renewing power is ¹faith." Jesus seems to have used the word in this sense more frequently than in any other. Over and over again He speaks of faith as necessary for physical or spiritual healing (Matt. 8:10, 9:2, 22, 29, 15:28, Mk. 2:5, 5:34, 10:52, Lk. 5:20, 7:9, 50, 8:48, 17:19, 18:42). The idea seems to be that just as the admission of evil spiritual influences leads to temptation and disease, so the opening of the doors of the heart to the Spirit of God strengthens a man against temptation and cures disease. The act of opening the heart to receive the Spirit of God is faith; consequently faith is necessary in order that disease may be cured and strength given to resist temptation.

b. Secondly, when the kingdom of God is thought of as offering an ideal around which a man ought to organize all the energies and activities of his life. The conative aspect of faith is the act of effecting such an organization; it is acting in accord with the new ideal. If a man could recognize that a course of action is good for his -----
 1. M. Scott Fletcher, 'The Psychology of the New Testament', p.84.

own life, and love it because of its goodness, and yet refuse to follow it, he would not have faith in the full sense in which Jesus uses the word. Faith, as He thought of it, involves not only an intellectual acceptance and emotional love of the Gospel, but also the performance of the duties required by it. Before the rule of God can be established in a man's heart, faith must be completed by action, or, at least, by the intention of putting the newly accepted ideal into action at once. Thus Jesus gives the story of a man who told his two sons to work in his vineyard. One said that he would, but did not; whereas the other said he would not, but did. Jesus regards the latter as the most commendable, and, as the moral of the story, concludes that the publicans and the harlots will go into the kingdom of God before the elders of the people (Matt. 21:28-31). In other words, unless a man carries his faith into action, the kingdom of God cannot be established within his heart.

c. Again, when Jesus is thought of as embodying the ideal of the kingdom, the conative aspect of faith may be spoken of as accepting or following Jesus. The idea is found in the Synoptics, but the other writings of the New Testament place a greater emphasis upon it. Its clearest

expression, perhaps, is in The Acts 16:31: "Believe on "the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved." In harmony with the emphasis which it always places on the person of Jesus, the Fourth Gospel also speaks frequently of believing on Him. In the Synoptics, confessing Jesus is practically the equivalent of accepting the Gospel.

Jesus promises that those who confess Him before men will be confessed before His Father in heaven, and He warns that those who deny Him will be denied before the Father in heaven (Matt.10:32-33). In other words, the acceptance of Christ as embodying the ideal of the kingdom is an essential part of the faith which admits a man to membership in the kingdom and to a share in the benefits of the salvation which it offers.

d. Finally, when God is regarded as the object of faith, its conative aspect is the active element in trust. We have seen that trust is both affective and conative: the affective element is a feeling of trust in God; the conative is the act of trusting. It is placing ourselves in God's hands without fear or worry. Jesus frequently seeks to develop this element of faith in the minds of His hearers: He tells them that if they, "being evil", give good gifts to their children, certainly the heavenly Father can be trusted

to give good things to those who ask Him (Matt.7:11); He teaches that if God cares for vegetable and animal life, He will surely care for men (Matt.6:26,28); and He urges that anxiety for food and clothes and the uncertainties of the morrow is useless in the light of God's love (Matt. 7:25,34).

The foregoing examination shows that faith, like repentance, has the three elements characteristic of all mental states. It involves knowing the ideal or the ideal personified, loving and trusting it, and wilfully acting in harmony with one's knowledge, love, and trust.

(d). The things which were said about repentance being a gift of God are equally applicable to faith. The same verses in the Synoptics establish the point for both. This is not surprizing in view of the fact, previously pointed out, that repentance and faith are not two entirely different things, but the negative and positive sides of the same state of consciousness. This state, as a whole, is sometimes called conversion. We have taken pains to point out in detail the various elements in it, but it must not be supposed that they occur seperately. Every such state is exceedingly complex, and when we separate the various elements which are involved in Jesus conception of repent-

ance and faith, we do not desire to suggest that He thought of them separately or analyzed them as we have sought to do.

III. Growth in Grace.

(A). We have been speaking as if the full benefits of the salvation offered by the kingdom of God are available for a man as soon as he repents and believes. This might be true if repentance and faith could be completed in a moment, or if the rule of God could be established in a man's heart in an instant. But, as a matter of fact, repentance and faith are never complete in this life; the rule of God in a man's heart is never so fully established that he does not occasionally sin; and no man, except Jesus, has ever been able to give God unlimited control in his life. Although the rule of God is partially established as soon as a man wills to repent and believe, and some of the benefits of that rule are enjoyed at once, yet the process of giving God complete control of one's life is usually long and difficult with many backslidings and many failures. The gradual development of the kingdom in the heart of man is suggested by the parables of growth. It is to be "first the blade, "then the ear, then the full corn in the ear" (Mk.4:28).

This parable may apply to the spread of the kingdom from heart to heart, but it also suggests the growth of the kingdom in the individual heart. Principal Robinson says: "The technical name for the process of development into which Christian repentance and faith form the natural entrance is ¹sanctification." It will be shown in the next chapter that sanctification is largely the work of the Spirit of God. Yet man can do something to aid this process; he is not altogether passive. We shall consider briefly some of the things which Jesus believes that man can do to aid in his sanctification.

(B). Things which Man Can Do to Aid God in the Work of Sanctification.

(a). First, Jesus seems to feel that it is a good thing both to confess one's sin openly and to acknowledge the new relationship with God into which one is entering. He commends the publican¹ who confesses his sins in the temple (Lk.18:13-14), and He promises that if men will confess their loyalty to Him before men He will confess them before His Father in heaven (Matt.10:32, Lk.12:8).

(b). Again, He expects the new converts to submit to baptism. The evidence for this point has been considered

1. H.W. Robinson, 'The Christian Doctrine of Man', p.331.

and need not be repeated. Nothing is said regarding what baptism is to do for a man, and there is no reason to discuss the matter here.

(c). Third, all three of the Synoptics contain an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper (Matt.26:26-29, Mk.14:22-25, Lk.22:14-20). The details of these accounts are frequently questioned because of their susceptibility to interpolation by the later Church, and it is doubtful whether Jesus really intends to institute a sacrament. If, however, when He says, "This do in remembrance of me" (Lk.22:19), He means to provide a sacrament for all future generations of Christians, this also should be added to the things which a man can do to aid in his own sanctification.

(d). Finally, Jesus teaches that prayer is of value in sanctifying men. Indeed, He lays great emphasis upon its value both for Himself and others. On numerous occasions, He spends hours at a time in earnest prayer (Mk.1:35, 6:46, 14:32f, Lk.5:16, 6:12). He seems to find in it refreshment of soul and strength for the task God has given Him to do. For similar reasons, He encourages His disciples and followers to pray. He gives them a model of prayer (Matt. 6:9-13), and speaks about the manner of their prayers and

the things for which they should pray (Matt.5:44, 6:6-7, 9:38, 26:41, Lk.10:2, 16:47, 18:1). Jesus' faith in prayer as a means to the ultimate attainment of complete salvation is unlimited: the Father knows the needs of His children before they ask Him (Matt.6:8); it is His will that they shall enjoy all the benefits of the kingdom (Lk.12:32); and it is necessary only that they shall ask in faith and they will receive (Matt.7:7-11, 18:19, 21:22, Lk.11:13).

Summary:

This completes our study of the things which man can do to receive the salvation of the kingdom. We have found that, in order for the kingdom to be set up in a man's heart, he must repent and have faith. Repentance is the recognition of the evil in our past standards of conduct and the actions resulting from them, a feeling of sorrow because we have been guilty of doing such things, and a turning from them toward the highest possible standard - the ideal of the kingdom of God either in its abstract form or embodied in God or Christ. Faith is the recognition of the essential goodness of this new standard or ideal, a feeling of love for it or trust in it, and acting in accord with this knowledge, love, and trust. Lastly, we have

shown that repentance and faith are never complete in this life, but that God expects men to advance toward the ideal. This process, which is called sanctification, is largely the work of the Holy Spirit, but man can aid in it by open Confession, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Prayer.

GIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOMI. Introduction.

(a). The purpose of the chapter is to consider the means which God uses in bestowing the gift of salvation.

(b). We are not concerned with any changes which may have taken place in the heart of God before this gift could become available.

(c). God not only gives salvation but also seeks the sinner in order to bestow the gift.

(d). Inasmuch as entering the kingdom requires repentance and faith, the problem of this chapter is to determine the means which God uses in arousing these attitudes.

(e). Jesus believes Himself to be the promised Messiah, and thinks that He is establishing the kingdom of God.

II. The General Plan to be Followed in Bestowing the Kingdom.

(a). This plan must be of a nature that will harmonize with the ethical and spiritual character of the kingdom. Jesus finds such a plan in the 'Servant of Jehovah' passages of Deutero-Isaiah.

(b). The Synoptic evidence that Jesus believed Himself to be fulfilling the Servant of Jehovah prophecies.

(c). Jesus is not the slave of prophecy. The nature of His genius.

(d). The identity of the Servant of Jehovah.

(e). The aspects of the Servant of Jehovah conception of interest for our study: His function, the methods He is to use in accomplishing His function, and His suffering. Discussion of these ideas.

(f). The manner in which Jesus believes Himself to be fulfilling the Servant of Jehovah passages.

GIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOMIII. The Specific Means which God Uses in Bestowing the Salvation of the Kingdom.(A). The Work of Christ.

(a). Jesus believes that He Himself is a means which God can use in establishing His kingdom. Evidence.

(b). He has great faith in the power of His message. Evidence.

(c). He recognizes the evidential value of His work, but speaks disparagingly of the value of outward signs in general.

(d). He has great faith in the power of His death to change the hearts of men. Evidence.

- (1) His death is the closing act of His life work.
- (2) The meaning of 'ransom'. Other Synoptic passages.

(B). The Work of Man.

Man can co-operate with Christ in the work of setting up the kingdom of God in the hearts of men.

(a). He can testify regarding Christ.

(b). He can carry on the work of preaching and teaching.

(c). He can seek to embody the ideal of the kingdom.

(d). He can pray for others.

IV. How the Means of Salvation are made Effective.

(a). Review of results and statement of problem.

- (1) The means discussed supply the knowledge necessary for the cognitive element in repentance and faith.
- (2) They also help to arouse the affective and conative elements by:

GIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOM

- a. Setting before men an attractive ideal.
- b. Embodying that ideal in a great personality.
- c. Revealing the intensity of the love of God.

(b). While Jesus believes that the methods which He uses are the most effective possible from a psychological standpoint, yet He recognizes that they are not always adequate. The grip of sin is so strong that men are not able to repent and believe. Some additional power is needed to make the means of salvation effective. This power is supplied by the Holy Spirit.

Summary.

CHAPTER X

GIVING THE SALVATION OF THE KINGDOMI. Introduction.

(a). The fact that the kingdom of God is a gift which is freely bestowed on men not only involves the idea that man should receive it but also that God should give it. In the preceding chapter, we studied what man can do to receive this gift. In the present chapter we shall consider the means God uses in bestowing it.

(b). It should be observed that this problem does not inquire what God does to make salvation available for men. It is conceivable (and it is frequently urged) that God's righteousness and justice demand that atonement shall be made for sin before man can be forgiven, and it is contended

that God Himself provided such atonement in the death of His own Son on the Cross. Whether this contention be true, need not concern us here. If Jesus believes, as we have seen, that the kingdom of God is knocking at the doors and windows of a man's heart, we need not pause, in a study of His conception of man, to ask how it came to be there. To return again to the analogy of the sun, if we are studying the value of sunlight in cleansing and purifying the inside of a house, it would be an unnecessary digression if we stopped to consider the physical and chemical changes which must take place in the body of the sun before it can send out light. So, in the study of Jesus' conception of man, it is much more important to know that God offers him salvation than to know what changes, if any, had to be effected in the heart of God before such salvation could be available. But, assuming, as Jesus does, that salvation is available, what does God do to bestow it? What is His part in establishing the kingdom in the heart of man?

(c). This question is made necessary by the fact that Jesus assumes not only that the salvation of the kingdom is available for men and will be given freely to those who ask for it, but also that God takes the initial step and seeks men in order to save them. He is not comparable to

a doctor who gives medical attention freely to those who come desiring it, but to one who goes from house to house seeking the sick and curing them without charge. Thus Jesus says that His mission is to "seek and to save that "which was lost" (Lk.19:10). He tells of the shepherd who, when one of his sheep was lost, sought after it until he found it (Lk.15:4), and of the woman who diligently searched for the lost coin until it was recovered (Lk.15:8). Our problem is to study the method which Jesus used in "seeking" the lost.

(d). Inasmuch as the kingdom of God is always represented as awaiting man's acceptance, and the requirements of such an acceptance are repentance and faith, our task to determine the means which God uses to awaken these qualities in man. Seeking the lost becomes a matter of arousing a man to repentance, and enkindling faith in his heart.

(e). We have seen that in the Old Testament the kingdom is sometimes believed to be established by the direct act of God, and sometimes through the agency of a Messiah; whereas, in the teaching of Jesus, it is always the work of the Messiah. Jesus regards Himself as this promised Messiah, and we shall see that He believes that He is establishing the kingdom of God; He is the agent whom God has sent

to set up His kingdom in the hearts of men.

II. The General Plan to be Followed in Bestowing the Kingdom.

(a). Before taking up the specific methods which Jesus uses in leading men into repentance and faith, some consideration should be given to the more general plan of His work. Had He accepted the political conception of the nature of the kingdom of God, we may take it for granted that He would have found it necessary to use external political methods in establishing it. We would have expected Him to regard Himself as a political or military leader, that is, the general conception of His task would have been political. In the same way, when we find that He thinks of the kingdom as ethical and spiritual and of its sphere as being the human heart, we may expect that His general plan of establishing it will be in harmony with the nature of the thing which He desires to establish, that is, it will be an ethical and spiritual plan, and the particular ethical and spiritual plan adopted will be one suited to the task of leading men into repentance and faith. Jesus seems to have found such a plan of the work of the Messiah in the "Servant of Jehovah" passages of Deutero-Isaiah. He accepts them as offering a general plan for His task of set-

ting up the kingdom in the hearts of men.

(b). The evidence that He believes Himself to be fulfilling the Servant of Jehovah prophecies is plentiful in the gospels. Luke records that immediately after His temptation He returns to Galilee, and in His own town of Nazareth, He stands up in the Synagogue to read, and, after reading a passage from the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah that deals with the Servant of Jehovah, He says, "To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears" (Lk.4:21). In Mark 9:12, He says that it is written of the Son of man "that He should suffer many things and be "set at nought". (See Is.53:2-3). In Luke 22:37, He refers again to the Servant of Jehovah passages of Isaiah 53 when He says, "This which is written must be fulfilled in "me, And He was reckoned with the transgressors." Matthew 12:17-21 is another passage of considerable length quoted from Isaiah 42:1-3. Jesus Himself does not speak the words, but, in the light of the passages quoted, there can be little doubt that Matthew is only following the example of Jesus in applying the words to his Master.

(c). To suggest that Jesus finds the general scheme for His task in the Servant of Jehovah conception of Isaiah, is not to argue that He has a detailed plan for His life work

that He mechanically and meticulously follows. Such a conception would make Him as much a slave of the past as those whom He denounces for tithing mint, anise, and cummin, and forgetting the weightier matters of the law. In fact, the Servant of Jehovah conception is not of such character that it could be fulfilled in detail. The picture drawn is highly imaginative and symbolical, and it is only its broader features which can be ascertained with a reasonable degree of certainty. Yet, in spite of its vagueness, the Servant of Jehovah conception presents a general plan for the salvation of men, and it is this general plan which Jesus accepts. It is no reflection on the genius of Jesus to say that He accepts the prophecies concerning the Servant of Jehovah as suggesting a method of establishing the kingdom of God that He may use successfully. Genius is not distinguished by originality in the sense of finding and using things that are entirely new. True genius consists in the ability to recognize and appropriate for one's own uses the things of highest value, whether old or new. Indeed, if the method of salvation suggested in the Servant of Jehovah passages is the most effective one that can be found, Jesus reveals His genius by accepting it.

(d). Little time need be spent in discussing the identity of the Servant of Jehovah. He has been variously held to be Israel, the righteous element in Israel, a specific individual - perhaps Jeremiah, the future Messiah, and a personification of the ideal Israel. The last suggestion is probably correct. The Servant of Jehovah is the personification of Israel, not as the nation actually is, but as it would be if it fulfilled God's ideal for it. Thus Davidson describes the servant as "an Israel in Israel, "something made up of the Divine forces concentrated in "Israel, its election, creation, endowment with God's word, "therefore, because Divine, indestructible, and that could "not fail of realizing God's purpose of salvation in Israel¹ "and thus in the world."

(e). The aspects of the Servant of Jehovah conception of greatest interest for our study are: His function, the methods He is to use in accomplishing this function, and His suffering. As for the first, Professor Davidson says that His "great function is: To bring forth judgment, i.e. practical religion, right acting, to the Gentiles, for they are "said to wait upon His law ($\square \square \square$) or teaching This "teaching seems elsewhere called light."² In another passage-----
 1. A.B. Davidson, 'Old Testament Prophecy', pp.444-5.
 2. " " " " , p.417.

age Davidson says: "The Servant is His (Jehovah's) instrument in effecting His great work. The work being to make known Himself, to make Him recognized as God alone, God in truth; The Servant must Himself be in possession of this truth, penetrated by it, inspired by it. And the work of the Servant is to bring this truth to the Gentiles - to bring forth judgment to the Gentiles -, to be the¹ light of the Gentiles."

The methods which the Servant is to use in accomplishing His task are suggested in the passage which Jesus reads in the Synagogue at Nazareth: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to^a proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn " (Isaiah 61:1-2).

Because of His noble task and splendid methods, it would seem fitting that the Servant should be kindly received, but God's purpose is otherwise. "Yet is^t pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief" (Is. 53:-----
1. A.B. Davidson, 'Old Testament Prophecy', p.419.

10), "He was despised, and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief" (Is.53:3). The question might naturally arise as to whether it was part of the Servant's mission to suffer. Davidson says not: "I do not think it is anywhere formally taught that the Servant's mission was to suffer. Suffering was no part of His mission, yet it is considered as inevitably connected with His mission."¹

(f). In the light of these ideas, it is not surprising that Jesus believes Himself to be fulfilling the Servant of Jehovah prophecies. If the servant is the personification of God's ideal of Israel as the nation ought to be, then certainly Jesus is that Servant; if the Servant's function is to make God known, to teach, to be a light to men, Jesus is fulfilling this function in setting up the kingdom of God in the hearts of men; and if the Servant's method is to "preach good tidings", "bind up the broken hearted", "proclaim liberty", etc., this method seems to be the only one that can be successfully used in establishing the kingdom of God in the hearts of men. Moreover, if suffering and death are "inevitably connected" with this method, Jesus may expect that He will be called upon to suffer, and, perhaps, to -----
1. A.B. Davidson, 'Old Testament Prophecy', p.453.

die.

This discussion makes it clear that the general plan which Jesus follows in fulfilling His mission as God's agent in giving the salvation of the kingdom is suggested to Him by the Servant of God passages of the Old Testament. It is the plan of embodying the God-ideal, preaching it, teaching it, serving one's fellows in accord with it, and patiently suffering because one's purposes are misunderstood, and then, having that very suffering turn into a means of victory. It need not be urged that the methods of Jesus would be different if the Servant of Jehovah passages did not exist. Indeed, it is possible that He sees in them, not a standard for His own action, but a prophetic description of what He knows Himself to be, and the methods which He feels called upon to follow in His work. Whatever be the fact, it is certain that He recognizes that He is, in the highest sense, a fulfilment of the Servant of Jehovah passages, and that the methods He is using in establishing the kingdom of God are essentially the methods which it is prophesied that the Servant of Jehovah will use.

These prophecies are not the only ones in the Old Testament that Jesus believes Himself to be fulfilling, but they are the ones that have special interest for us in this

chapter because they suggest the general plan that He follows in setting up the kingdom of God.

III. The Specific Means which God uses in Bestowing the Salvation of the Kingdom.

(A). The Work of Christ.

Our discussion of the general plan which Jesus accepts as a guide for His task of setting up the kingdom in the hearts of men has led to the conclusion that He conceives Himself to be the Servant of Jehovah spoken of in Old Testament prophecy, and consequently the methods He uses are essentially the Servant's methods. We shall now consider more in detail what these methods are, and how Jesus expects them to be effective in establishing the kingdom in the hearts of men.

(a). In the first place, Jesus believes that He Himself is a means that God can use in establishing His kingdom. We have seen that this idea is a part of the Servant of Jehovah conception. The Servant's task is to make God known, and, in order to do it, He must be "in possession of "the truth, penetrated by it, inspired by it". He is "to "be the light of the Gentiles." In fulfilment of this idea, Jesus believes that His own personality has great significance for the establishment of the kingdom of God in

the hearts of men. As we have seen, He incarnates His own message. He preaches to men of God's eternal love, but He Himself is an embodiment of that love. He describes to them the Fatherly character of God, but that character is best portrayed in the life of a perfect Son. Professor Beyschlog sums up the point when he says:

"Every guarantee for the truth of the Gospel lay in Him,
 "in His personal certainty of God and communion with God,
 "and therefore He Himself as the real mediator of salvation,
 "stood behind the word as a means of grace from the very
 "first."¹

(b). A second means which Jesus believes to be effective in establishing the kingdom of God in the hearts of men is His message. This idea also is suggested by the Servant of Jehovah prophecies. The Servant is "to restore the pre-served of Israel", and be a "light to the Gentiles" (Is.49:6) by preaching "good tidings", proclaiming liberty, etc. In the same way, Jesus believes that repentance and faith can be aroused in the hearts of men by His own preaching and teaching. The seed from which the kingdom will grow is the "word" (Mk.4:14). The sustaining force of spiritual life is not bread, but "every word that proceedeth out

 1. Willibald Beyschlag, 'New Testament Theology', Vol.I, p.148

"of the mouth of God" (Matt.4:4). The power which is expected to lead to repentance is the preaching of the word (Matt.12:41). When He preaches in the Synagogue at Capernaum, the people are astonished because His word is "with authority" (Lk.4:31-32). He Himself is confident that His word shall not pass away (Matt.24:35). He says that the Gospel must be preached in all the world before the consummation of the kingdom can take place (Matt.24:14). He is said to have sent out His followers to "make disciples of all the nations" (Matt.28:19). In fact, the greater part of the ministry of Jesus is spent in teaching and preaching. He begins His work with a call to repent and believe the Gospel (Mk.1:15), yet He knows that neither will be fully possible for many men until they have had the privilege of hearing His message.

(c). Thirdly, Jesus believes that His works (τὰ ἔργα) of kindness and love are a means that God is using to establish His kingdom in the hearts of men. They are to have value in convincing men that both He and His message are of God. Emphasis should not be placed on this point either in the Servant of Jehovah prophecies or the teaching of Jesus, for He sometimes speaks disparagingly of the value of outward signs as a means of changing the hearts

of men (Matt.12:38-42, 16:1-4, Mk.8:11-12, Lk.11:29-30). Nevertheless, although He feels deeply that truth speaks for itself and no external signs are needed to prove its value, yet He is aware that His works do have this effect in actual practice. He tells the disciples of John the Baptist, who come asking whether or not He is the Messiah, to go back and tell John of the works He is doing, and He assumes that these works are a sufficient answer to John's question (Matt.11:2-6) Lk.7:18-23). He pronounces woes upon the cities "wherein most of His might works were done" because they did not repent, and He declares that Tyre and Sidon and Sodom are not so blameworthy because they did not have the advantage of such works (Matt.11:20-24). Lastly, in reply to the Pharisees who accuse Him of using demonic means to cast out devils, He argues that Satan would not cast out Satan; therefore He (Jesus) must be working by the Spirit of God. But, if so, this fact is evidence that the kingdom of God has been established in their midst (Matt.12:28). Thus, although Jesus shrinks from the use of signs for the sake of signs, yet He recognizes that His works have value in convincing men of the truth of His claims and thus preparing the way for repentance and faith.

(d). Finally, Jesus teaches that His own death is a

means that God will use to establish His kingdom in the hearts of men. This idea is in harmony with the passages in Old Testament prophecy that picture the Servant of God as suffering for others, and it is likely that it is meditation on these passages that leads Jesus to the idea that He also must suffer and die. It is impossible for us to enter into a discussion concerning the full significance of the death of Jesus. As was previously suggested, the only phase of the problem that is of interest for our present study is whether Jesus believes that His death has value in inducing man to repent and accept the Gospel. Any special significance which it may have for God is outside the scope of our consideration.

It is not altogether certain whether, at the beginning of His ministry, He realizes fully that this last drastic act will be required. In Mark 2:20, He speaks of the bridegroom being "taken away from them" and it is possible that this is an allusion to His death. It is best, perhaps, not to lay too much stress upon this verse. It may be that at the beginning of His ministry He hopes to accomplish His work without the sacrifice of His life, but when those who hear His message fail to respond as He hopes that they will, His death becomes a necessity. It seems

more likely, however, that the above allusion does refer to the death of Jesus, and that from the very beginning He realizes that His mission will ultimately require His death. He says little about it in the early part of His ministry because He feels that He will not be understood, but later, when the disciples have been trained, He feels that the time has come to speak. But whatever may have been true in the beginning, it is certain that as the end draws near, He speaks of His death and regards it as having great significance for the final consummation of the kingdom and the completion of the work of salvation. The evidence for this fact is not large in amount, but it is very conclusive.

(1). In the first place, it seems clear that Jesus regards His death as the closing act of His life work. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mk.10:45). The life and death of Jesus are here tied up in one great mission. The key to understanding His death in its broadest aspects, is to understand the purpose of His whole life. "He did not live for one end and die for another."¹ Our previous study of the means which Jesus uses to bring men

1. Stevens, 'The Teaching of Jesus', p.148.

into the kingdom of God has made clear the purpose of His life. The verse quoted above proves that Jesus regards His death as His last effort toward the accomplishment of that purpose.

(2). Again, in this verse, Jesus speaks of giving His life a "ransom for many". A ransom is a price paid to redeem some one from bondage. There has been a great deal of discussion regarding the meaning of this phrase, but, in the light of the fact that Jesus regards His death as the closing act of His life, the true meaning seems evident. It is a figurative expression which suggests that Jesus feels that His death will redeem men from the bondage of sin: it will help to establish the kingdom of God and thus break the bonds of Satan.¹ The many who are to be ransomed are the same people whom Jesus spends His life to save.² Matthew 26:28 and its parallels in Mark 14:24 and Luke 22:20 confirm this idea. Jesus says in Matthew: "This is My blood of the covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The last phrase, "for the remission of sins" may not have been a part of the

1. See Shailer Matthews, 'The Gospel and the Modern Man', p.188.

2. It is not meant to suggest that our interpretation exhausts the meaning of any of the verses discussed under this point. They may mean a great deal more, but they mean this much at least.

original saying of Jesus inasmuch as it is not found in the Markan original or in the Lukan parallel. There are sufficient differences, however, in the three versions, to justify one in regarding it as a possibility that the verse was included in Q, and, if so, the last phrase may have been original. If not, it at least shows the interpretation of Matthew. Jesus' blood is shed for many in order that their sins may be forgiven. It ratifies a covenant of forgiveness. These two sayings of Jesus together with the passages in which they are included and Mark 8:31-35, Luke 12:50 and possibly one or two others, make it clear that Jesus feels that His death is the final means of winning men to salvation. That this interpretation is correct is further proved by the testimony of the Fourth Evangelist: In John 6:44 he quotes Jesus as saying that "No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him," and in 12:32, he says: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." These passages make it clear that Jesus believes that He is bestowing the kingdom on man by embodying the ideal of the kingdom, by His teaching, by His work, and finally, by His death.

(B). The Work of Man.

Although Jesus regards the task of setting up the kingdom of God in the hearts of men as essentially His own, yet He believes that men can co-operate in it. He is to begin it, but others, who have learned the meaning of the kingdom from Him, can "take up the torch" and carry on the work both during His lifetime and after His death.

(a). First, He expects others to testify regarding Himself. Inasmuch as He is a revelation of God, and the embodiment of the ideal of the kingdom of God, it is desirable that men shall recognize Him as such; consequently, He expects those who really know Him to tell others. The best evidence of this is in Matthew 10:32-33, Lk.12:8-9: "Everyone therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."

(b). Again, He desires men to carry on the work of preaching and teaching. Thus He sends out the twelve with the command, "Go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt.10:7). He says, "What I tell you in the darkness, speak ye in the light: and what ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the house tops" (Matt.10:27). He tells men to "preach the Gospel", and speaks about "wheresoever

"the Gospel shall be preached" (Mk.16:15, 14:9). And He bids His followers to go, "and make disciples of all nations"..... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I "commanded you" (Matt.28:18-20).

(c). Thirdly, although Jesus does not expect men to embody the ideal of the kingdom as perfectly as He Himself has done, or to be as free from sin as He, yet He does believe that they can approximate these ideals and thus become "a light of the world" even though a ~~dimmer~~ one than He. Thus, whereas in the Fourth Gospel Jesus says: "I am the "light of the world" (Jn.8:12), in the Synoptics, He says of His disciples: "Ye are the light of the world" (Matt.5:14), and adds "Let your light shine before men, that they "may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is "in heaven" (Matt.5:16). The significance of these passages is increased when we remember that the function of the Servant of Jehovah is to be a light to the Gentiles.

(d). Finally, Jesus teaches that men can pray for others. It is remarkable how little there is in the Synoptics on this point. Even the Lord's prayer has nothing about others. Yet Jesus does not ignore the idea altogether. He says, "Pray for them that persecute you".(Matt.5:44). There can be little doubt that the meaning is: pray for

their salvation.

We see then that although Jesus believes Himself to be God's chief agent in bestowing the kingdom on men, He recognizes that a part of this function can be delegated to others, and that men can co-operate in the work of His mission by publically confessing their faith in Christ, preaching and teaching the Gospel, living Christ-like lives, and praying for others.

IV. How the Means of Salvation are Made Effective.

(a). We have seen that, inasmuch as the kingdom is a free gift which God bestows on all who repent and have faith, the chief problem in connection with bestowing this gift is that of arousing these attitudes. We have pointed out that Jesus believes the task of setting up the kingdom in the hearts of men to be essentially His own, and that He seeks to accomplish this task by incarnating the kingdom ideal, by preaching and teaching it, by performing mighty works of kindness and love, and by giving His life. We have shown further that He seeks the co-operation of men by inviting them to give testimony regarding Himself, to preach and teach the same Gospel, to live in accord with this Gospel, and to pray for others. The problem remains of showing how

these methods can be effective in accomplishing the result desired. That is, how can preaching and teaching the Gospel, doing works of kindness and love, living a God-like life, and dying on a cross, lead men to repent and have the faith necessary for the rule of God to be established in their hearts?

Although there are some suggestions along the line of this problem in the gospels, Jesus Himself gives no complete answer to it. He makes very clear to us the goal that He wishes to reach and the methods by which He hopes to reach that goal, but He does not tell us how these methods will be effective in accomplishing the desired result. It is doubtful whether a fully satisfactory answer can be given, but some light is thrown on the problem by the modern psychological ideas we have studied.

(1). In the first place, inasmuch as both repentance and faith have cognitive elements, the methods used by Jesus supply the knowledge required. We have seen that the cognitive element in repentance is the recognition of the inadequacy and consequent sinfulness of the lower ideals that one has been seeking, whereas the cognitive element of faith is the realization of the adequacy of the ideal that one is about to seek. It is sometimes thought that the best way

of convincing a man that his ideals and actions are evil is to denounce them - to insist that they are bad and that he ought to abandon them. On the other hand, it may be thought that the way to arouse faith in a new and a higher ideal is to extol its virtues and praise its inherent value. Inasmuch, however, as repentance and faith are the negative and positive aspects of the same state of consciousness, the best way of arousing both is by such a comparison of ideals and standards of conduct that a man can appraise their inherent value for himself. The methods of Jesus are adapted to bringing about such a comparison. He sometimes denounces the sins of men, and the lower ideals which lead to sin; but His usual plan is to preach the ideal of the kingdom, and to assume that men are sufficiently familiar with lower ideals to make the comparison for themselves. Thus, by preaching, teaching, living a God-like life, and dying a God-like death, He seeks to institute such a comparison of ideals in the minds of men that they will recognize the inherent superiority of the kingdom over every other ideal to which they may be tempted to give their loyalty.¹

If such recognition can be brought about, the cognitive

1. The word 'ideal' seems unsatisfactory when used to describe the goal or focus point of faith, but it seems to be the best word available for the idea.

element in both repentance and faith will be supplied.

(2). It need not be insisted that the methods which Jesus uses are always successful in supplying the cognitive element necessary to repentance and faith. It cannot be denied, however, that they sometimes produce this effect; some of His hearers are led to recognize the difference between right and wrong, to regard their present standards of conduct as low and evil, and to see in the kingdom of God the highest possible standard. But supposing this point to have been reached, how does Jesus expect that His methods will produce the other required elements in repentance and faith? that is, how does He believe that the things which He is doing will induce men to be sorry for their sins, to love and trust God and His goodness, and to turn from sin unto God. As was suggested, a full answer cannot be given to this problem; yet the considerations which follow have value, and it is probable that they are assumed by Jesus.

a. In the first place, although the idea that "Vice" is a monster of such frightful mien, that to be hated needs "but to be seen" is psychologically very doubtful, it is true that goodness, if actually recognized, is so attractive that it commands admiration and may produce love. Thus

when Jesus, by means of His message, His life of loving service, and His sacrificial death on the cross, sets before men the glorious ideal of the kingdom of God, He realizes that none who really understand it can refrain from admiring it, and that many will be led to accept it and love and trust the God whose will it represents.

b. Secondly, we may reasonably suppose that Jesus recognizes the power of an ideal embodied in a real person - especially in a strong personality. Many a great cause has languished for lack of a capable leader, whereas many an imperfect ideal, when espoused by a man or a woman of strong personality, has had a tremendous influence on the world. When therefore the ideal under consideration is the highest that the mind of man can conceive, and the person embodying it is the greatest who has ever lived, it is not unreasonable to believe that large numbers of men will be led to accept it, will gladly turn from the things which commanded their loyalty in the past, and will follow their new leader with enthusiasm.

c. Again, Jesus believes that the methods which He is using to set up the kingdom of God in the hearts of men are especially adapted for producing the affective and conative elements in repentance and faith because they reveal

God's love so perfectly. It is a well authenticated fact that love begets love, and if men can be convinced that God loves them, the natural response will be to love Him in return. But if men love God, the victory is won; for, inasmuch as sin displeases God, they will be sorry for their sins and turn from them, and, since the ideal of the kingdom is God's will, they will accept it joyfully and organize their lives around it. As has been said, the methods which Jesus uses are especially adapted to convincing men of God's love for them. His message proclaims it; His life of loving services reveals it; and His death, willingly accepted as a part of His mission, is a final proof of the intensity of God's love. It is impossible for us to imagine any course of action better suited to the task of convincing men that God loves them and of arousing love and devotion in return. If men will not repent and have faith in God, when they hear His love preached to them, see it embodied in a life of unselfishness, and finally poured out for them in suffering and death, no method that we can imagine will touch them.

(b). While Jesus believes that the methods He uses to establish the kingdom in the hearts of men ought to be effective, and although, from a psychological standpoint, they are

the most effective methods that we can imagine, yet He recognizes that the attractiveness of lesser ideals is sometimes so great that man simply cannot make the response that he ought to the message of salvation. His heart may be so hardened by sin that he cannot love God, or, even if he is capable of loving God, other values may be so precious to him that it is impossible to give them up. Thus, in the case of the rich young man who came to Jesus asking what he might do to inherit eternal life, Jesus admits that the sacrifice which repentance requires of such a man is beyond the power of the man himself (Mk.10:27). Riches, loyalty to one's family or one's friends, or some of the other possible goals of life, may get such a hold on a man that no psychological appeal, however effective, can induce him to give them up. Some additional power is needed to save him. Jesus suggests this power when He says, with reference to the inability of the rich to repent, "For all things are possible with God" (Mk.10:27). The idea undoubtedly is that if a man would really like to repent but is not able, God will give him the power. The Synoptics do not explain what this power is, but the Fourth Gospel makes clear that it is the Holy Spirit. Thus, in His conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus says: "The wind bloweth where it listeth,

"and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence
"it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is
"born of the Spirit." (Jn.3:8). The idea is that 'rebirth'
or conversion, and the sanctification which should follow,
whatever their immediate causes, are ultimately due to the
work of the Holy Spirit. It is not possible to prove
this point from the Synoptics, but, in the light of the
verse mentioned above, the general psychological ideas pre-
viously studied, and the testimony of the Fourth Gospel, it
is very probable that Jesus believes that His message, His
life, and His death will be made effective by the power of
the Holy Spirit working in the hearts of men.

Summary:

The discussion of this chapter has aimed to make
clear the methods which God uses in establishing His king-
dom. Since we are studying Jesus' conception of man, we
have confined ourselves strictly to the human side of the
problem. We have pointed out, not only that the salvation
of the kingdom is a gift of God, but also that God's love
is so great that He seeks man in order to bestow the gift.
We have shown that, inasmuch as the reception of the gift
is conditioned by repentance and faith, the methods used in

bestowing it must be such as will arouse these attitudes. We have recognized that Jesus believed Himself to be God's agent in bestowing this gift, and, seeking for[^] the general plan which He follows on carrying out His mission, we have found it in the Servant of Jehovah passages of Deutero-Isaiah. In harmony with this general plan, we have seen that the specific methods which He uses to establish the kingdom are:

- (1) preaching and teaching the Gospel of the kingdom
- (2) embodying it in his life, (3) manifesting it in His work, and (4) revealing it in His death. we have shown further that Jesus believed that man can co-operate with Him in the work of establishing the kingdom by publically confessing that Jesus is their Lord- the Messiah, by carrying on His work of preaching and teaching, by living in accord with the kingdom ideal, and by praying for others. When it is asked how these methods can be effective in producing repentance and faith, we have admitted that the problem is not entirely solvable, but have shown that this result can be partially explained psychologically by the fact that the methods provide the knowledge required by the cognitive elements in repentance and faith, and tend to produce the effective and conative elements by presenting an attractive ideal, embodying it in a strong personality,

and presenting such a picture of the love of God that it can scarcely fail to call forth love in response. Finally, we have shown that, in addition to their psychological appeal, the methods of Jesus are made effective by a power of God which is probably to be identified with the Holy Spirit.

THE SONSHIP OF MANI. Introduction.

(a). In addition to the kingdom of God conception, the family idea is also found in the Synoptics.

(1) Points of similarity between the kingdom and the family ideas.

(2) Points of difference between the two ideas.

(b). The relation of the family idea to the Old Testament.

(c). Its chief expression in the Synoptics is the word 'Father'.

(d). The three divisions of the family idea: Fatherhood, sonship, and brotherhood.

II. The Universal Fatherhood of God.

(A). Two questions involved: (1) Is God the Father of all men? (2) What is the essence of Fatherhood?

(a). The argument that God is not the Father of all men.

(b). The proof that God is the Father of all men.

(c). The essence of Fatherhood. Wendt's definition: "unmerited, bountiful, forgiving love."

III. Man's Sonship to God.

(A). Are some Men Sons of God?

(a). Jesus gives an affirmative answer to the question.

(1) The idea of Fatherhood implies the existence of sons.

(2) Jesus believes that He Himself is a son of God.

(3) He recognizes other men as God's sons. Evidence.

THE SONSHIP OF MAN(B). Are all Men Sons of God?

(a). Discussion of evidence and conclusion that sonship is not universal.

(C). The Qualities which make Men Potential Sons of God.

(a). A capacity for knowledge of spiritual things.

(b). A capacity for moral judgment.

(c). An ability to love the right and the good.

(d). Moral freedom.

(e). A capacity for direct communion and fellowship with God.

(D). The Characteristics of Actual Sonship.

Sonship is essentially an attitude. It has active and passive aspects.

(a). The active aspect of sonship is unselfish, aggressive love. It involves loving God with all one's heart, soul, strength, and mind, and loving one's neighbor as one's self. This love has the three psychological elements characteristic of all states of mind.

- (1) The cognitive element is a recognition of the lovable qualities in both God and man.
- (2) The affective element is a feeling of love toward God and one's fellow men.
- (3) The conative element is the act of transforming one's knowledge and feeling into deeds of love for God and man.

(b). The passive aspect of sonship is an attitude of willing acceptance of everything that may be in accord with God's sovereign will.

- (1) The cognitive aspect is the recognition that God's love is so perfect that He can be trusted implicitly.

THE SONSHIP OF MAN

- (2) The affective element is the feeling of trust in God and His goodness.
- (3) The conative element is the act of surrendering one's will and all its desires to the will of God.

Summary of Chapter.

CHAPTER XI

THE SONSHIP OF MANI. Introduction.

(a). In the preceding chapters, we have studied the natural man, the natural man corrupted by sin, and the salvation offered by the kingdom of God. Our study of Jesus' conception of man as a religious being would not be complete, however, if we did not consider him from a slightly different angle. When the kingdom of God is under consideration, the characteristic picture of God is that of a sovereign ruler. We have shown that the essential meaning of the kingdom is the rule of God; consequently, when the kingdom is mentioned, the relationship between God and man which naturally comes to mind is that of sovereign and subject. The Synop-

tic teaching of Jesus contains another view of this relationship, however, which is so rich in meaning that it cannot be ignored. It pictures God as regarding man with the attitude of a Father to a son, and replaces the idea of the kingdom with that of the family. It must not be supposed that these two ideas are kept entirely separate. On the contrary, although Jesus speaks frequently about the kingdom of God, yet He never calls God 'king' and, while He does not speak of the family, yet His characteristic name for God is 'Father'.

(1). We shall see that the ideas of the family and the kingdom have much in common. The Ruler of the kingdom is the same as the Father of the family; the citizens of the kingdom are to be identified with those who are sons in the strictest sense of sonship; the salvation of the kingdom includes the fellowship which exists between God and those who are His true sons; and the ethical requirements of the kingdom are the same as the requirements of sonship and brotherhood in the highest sense.

(2). But, although the family and the kingdom have much in common, yet we shall find that there are points of difference. The kingdom idea is used in one sense only: men either are or are not members of the kingdom of God; they

are either in it or outside of it. The family idea, however, is used much more loosely: in a broad sense, all men are members of the family of God, but, in a narrow sense, only those men are members of it who belong to the kingdom of God; both sonship and brotherhood have two distinct meanings.

(b). The family idea, like that of the kingdom, is derived from the Old Testament. Thus the Psalmist speaks of God as Father (Ps.68:5, 89:26, 103:13), and men are spoken of as "sons" of God (II Sam. 7:14, Ps.2:7, Hos.11:1). But although the idea is found, it is not so characteristic of the Old Testament as that of the kingdom. The Old Testament usually thinks of God as king, and men as subjects. Such intimacy as is suggested by the words that denote the various relationships of family life is comparatively rare.

(c). The chief (although not the only) expression for the family idea in the teaching of Jesus is the word 'Father'. It is used much more frequently in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptics, but its use in the Synoptics is sufficient to show that it was often on the lips of Jesus. He speaks of God as "Father" ten times, as "My Father" nineteen times, as "your Father" eighteen times, as "thy Father" twice, as "our Father" twice, as the "Father" of the righteous once, and

as the "Father" of the Son of man once. In addition to these direct references, He tells the story of the prodigal son in which the father is unquestionably meant to represent God and the son, man.

(d). If a full study of the family idea in the teaching of Jesus were contemplated, it would be divided naturally into three parts: the Fatherhood of God, the sonship of man, and the brotherhood of man. Inasmuch, however, as our study is limited to Jesus' conception of man, only the briefest consideration can be given to the first of these subjects. The sonship of man and the brotherhood of man will be studied more in detail, the former in the present chapter, and the latter in the chapter which follows.

II. The Universal Fatherhood of God.

(A). Before taking up the consideration of Jesus' conception of sonship, two questions need to be answered concerning the Fatherhood of God: (1) Is God the Father of all men? (2) And, what is the essence of Fatherhood?

(a). There is some evidence in the Synoptics that might be interpreted as meaning that God is not the Father of all men. In nearly every case in which Jesus speaks of God as Father, He addresses His disciples, and it may be asked

rightly whether He does not mean that God is the Father of the righteous only. In Matthew 13:43, He is explicitly spoken of as the Father of the righteous, and again it is a legitimate question whether He means to suggest that God's Fatherhood is limited to them. Weiss accepts this interpretation of Fatherhood: "It is by no means the relation in which God stands to all men which it is meant to represent in this way; it is the members of the kingdom as whose Father in heaven Jesus designates God, and whom He teaches to pray to God as their Father."¹

(b). In opposition to the above interpretation, it may be pointed out that in many of the sayings in which God is spoken of as 'Father' no reference is made to the righteous. On the contrary the term seems more of a general name for God than a description of His relationship with any particular group. In Matthew 11:25-27, He is spoken of as "Father, Lord of heaven and earth"; In Matthew 28:19, the disciples are to baptize in the name of the Father; in Mark 13:32, the Father alone knows the day and the hour when the end shall come; in Mark 14:36, the Father is the one who is able to do all things; in Luke 10:22, the Son only knows the Father. These verses seem to indicate that Fatherhood is one of the qualities, perhaps the essential

1. B. Weiss, 'Biblical Theology of the New Testament', Vol.I, p.93.

quality, of the character of God, and that God is the Father of men without regard to the attitude which they may take toward Him. Several other things in the gospels point in the same direction. In Matthew 5:44-45, He urges His disciples to love their enemies, for in so doing they will be the sons of God who expresses His Fatherly character by causing "His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust." Thus, Jesus implies that God is the Father of all, although all may not be sons. The story of the prodigal son suggests the same thought (Lk.15:11-32). Even when the son realizes that he has sinned and is "no more worthy to be called"... 'son,' the father has not ceased to be a father, and his arms are open wide to his repentant boy.

This specific evidence is supplemented by the general picture which Jesus gives of God's relationship with men. We have seen that He thinks of man as sinful and estranged from God, but He always pictures God's Fatherhood as perfect. Man may wander away from God, but God does not cease to love him and long for his return. The "Joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth" is the joy of Father love. Indeed it is not too much to say that the "good news" which Jesus preaches to men is the news of the "universal

"Fatherhood" of God. It is not the will of a God who is essentially a Father that one of His children should perish (Matt.18:14).

(c). When the question is raised regarding the essence of God's Fatherhood, we cannot do better than answer it in the words of Wendt: "God does not become the Father, but is the heavenly Father even of those who become His sons. "This idea would be inconceivable, if in the Fatherhood "and Sonship the mere relation of procreator and procreated "were understood; for manifestly the Fatherhood of the one "implies also the existence of Sonship in the other. But, "for the consciousness of Jesus, it is not the relation of "God to man as Creator which primarily is taken into account in His name of Father, but His unmerited, bountiful, "forgiving love. That relation He maintains always and "universally, in that He bestows His benefits on the good "and on the evil. His very perfection consists in this love; "and it can as little be conceived that God is not eternally "and always Father, and does not always act as such, as it "can be conceived that God requires to become perfect."¹

If then it be established that God is the Father of all men, and that the essence of Fatherhood is an attitude -----
1. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol.I, p.193.

of "unmerited, bountiful, forgiving love," what is the significance of these facts for Jesus' conception of man?

This brings us to the main problem which this chapter is to consider: What are the ideas of Jesus with reference to man's sonship to God?

III. Man's Sonship to God.

The first problem that arises in connection with these ideas is whether universal Fatherhood implies universal sonship. Does Jesus believe that some men are sons of God? And, if so, is this sonship universal?

(A). Are some Men Sons of God?

(a). The Synoptics leave no room to doubt regarding Jesus' answer to this question. There is plenty of evidence, both direct and indirect, which shows that He believes some men, at least, to be sons of God.

(1). In the first place, the idea of Fatherhood implies the existence of sons. If Fatherhood is essentially an attitude that God takes toward men, it is conceivable that He might be the Father of all men without having any real sons. But, although this is possible, yet it is not the usual implication of Fatherhood, and we shall see that Jesus does not think of Fatherhood in this way. When He

speaks of God as Father, He thinks of Him as Father, not only because He has a Fatherly attitude toward men, but also because some men, at least, are His sons.

(2). Jesus believes Himself to be the first in rank and importance among the sons of God. We need not enter into the question of His conception of the difference between His own Sonship and that of ordinary men. It is sufficient for our present purpose to point out that He believes Himself to be a Son of God. We have seen that He speaks of "My Father" nineteen times. He also speaks of Himself as "Son" eleven times. He does not call Himself the "Son of God" in the Synoptics; but, when called that by others, He accepts the title (Matt.26:63-64), and He is accused of claiming the title for Himself (Matt.27:43).

In the parable of the householder who plants a vineyard, Jesus seems to refer to Himself when He speaks of the 'son' (Matt.21:37). He hears Himself called "My beloved Son" at His baptism, and at the time of His transfiguration and accepts the name (Matt.3:17, 17:5). It is clear then that He believes God to have at least one son.

(3). But He makes it equally clear that there are other sons of God. It has been shown that He uses the expression "your Father" eighteen times in speaking to His

disciples. This would not prove that there were sons of God, but there can be little doubt that it is implied.

In addition to these indications, there is some quite positive testimony on the point. In Matthew 5:45, He tells His disciples that if they will love their enemies and manifest good will toward all, they will be the sons of their Father which is in heaven. In Matthew 5:9, He says that the peace-makers "shall be called sons of "God." In Luke 6:35, which is probably a parallel of Matthew 5:45, He tells His disciples that, if they love their enemies and do good, they will be the "sons of the "Most High"; and in Luke 20:36, He says that those who attain to the resurrection of the dead "are sons of God". These passages are sufficient to show that men may attain, and, in some cases, have attained, sonship to God.

(B). Are all Men Sons of God?

(a). Having satisfied ourselves that Jesus regards some men, at least, as sons of God, our next problem is to determine whether He believes this sonship to be universal. The passages which bear on the point are practically the same as those that have been considered. The verses mentioned above which speak of "your Father", "our Father", and "thy Father" are inconclusive. They indicate that

God is the Father of the disciples, and that they are His sons; but there is nothing in them that would enable us to determine whether or not other men are privileged to share the same blessing. The passage in which God is spoken of as the 'Father of the righteous' suggests that there are men who are not righteous, and consequently do not stand in the same relation to God (Matt.13:43). In the story of the prodigal son, Jesus pictures the prodigal as realizing that his sins have so changed his relationship with his father that he is "no more worthy to be called" his "son" (Lk.15:19). This is an intimation that only those who stand in a proper relation to God are worthy to be sons of God. That which is indicated in these two passages is brought out more clearly in the "son" passages mentioned above. When the disciples are told that, if they love their enemies and do good to everyone, they will be the sons of their Father in heaven, it is quite clearly inferred that, if they fail to do these things, they will not have this privilege (Matt.5:45, Lk.6:35). Matthew 5:9 would be meaningless when it speaks of peace-makers called sons of God if those who are not peace-makers have an equal right to the title. The same inference is necessary in Luke 20:36. These passages make it clear that Jesus does not re-

gard all men as sons of God. In the words of Professor Stevens: "God is always the Father, and the Father of all, "for He is always what He ought to be; He always corresponds to His idea; in Him the ideal and the real are identical. But with men it is not so. They are, indeed, morally kindred to God, and, in that sense, sons of God. They are also ideally, that is, in the Divine idea of humanity, sons of God, since man is made and designed for fellowship with God and likeness to God; but, in fact, men realize their idea but imperfectly; many by wilful sin repudiate their true filial relation to God and are 'no more worthy' to be called God's sons. Accordingly we find that Jesus was not accustomed to speak of all men as sons of God."

(C). The Qualities which make Men Potential Sons of God.

If man is not a child of God simply because he is a man, and yet some men attain sonship, the question naturally arises as to what qualities or capacities men must have in order to be capable of acquiring this sonship, and whether all men have these qualities. In other words, what is it in man that makes him a potential son of God, and do all men have such potentialities?

1. Stevens, 'The Teaching of Jesus', p.75.

In this matter as in most of the others we have considered, Jesus gives us no direct teaching, and we are forced to reach our conclusions by inference.

(a). The first quality then which Jesus believes that men possess and which He regards as necessary for sonship¹ is a capacity for knowledge of spiritual things. To be capable of becoming sons of God men must be able to understand and appreciate His will and purpose. It has been suggested that sonship is practically identical with membership in the kingdom of God, although it involves looking at man from a different angle. Inasmuch as this is true, repentance and faith are the entrance requirements to sonship as truly as to citizenship in the kingdom. But we have shown that repentance and faith require a knowledge of spiritual things. It is evident then that in demanding repentance and faith of men, Jesus recognizes that they are capable of such knowledge. If further proof is needed, it may be seen in the fact that He spends the greater part of His ministry teaching. Teaching always assumes a capacity for learning; consequently, when He teaches men what they must do to become sons of God, He assumes this capacity.

1. This, and the following three points are suggested by James Robertson, 'Our Lord's Teaching', p.47.

Moreover, inasmuch as He demands repentance and faith of all men, and willingly teaches all who desire it, it is clear that He believes this capacity to be in all.

(b). The second quality of potential sonship that Jesus recognizes in man is a capacity for moral judgment, that is, man is able to some degree to choose between right and wrong. He can select standards, and measure values in accord with these standards. If his standards are wrong, his moral judgments will be wrong, for the mere possession of such a capacity does not guarantee that the judgments made will be correct. Nevertheless, without this capacity, man can never become a son of God. That Jesus believes man to possess such a capacity was assumed when we discussed the idea of organizing life around ideals. The idea is presupposed in all His teaching, as it must necessarily be in all moral teaching; consequently it needs no elaboration.

(c). Again, Jesus believes that men are capable of "moral affection" or the ability to love the right and the good. Inasmuch as repentance and faith have affective elements, this capacity also is assumed in the demand made upon all men to repent and have faith in the Gospel. If faith requires loving the good, it would be foolish to ask men to

have faith if they lacked the capacity for such love.

(d). The fourth quality necessary before a man can enter into a filial relation with God is moral freedom. A son is not a automaton who does the Divine will because he can do nothing else, but a free moral being who obeys God's will because he so chooses. Such choices are possible only if men have some power of self-determination and moral freedom. Our chapter on the subject has shown that Jesus believes men to have this power.

(e). The last quality which Jesus assumes to be necessary in order that men may become sons is a capacity for direct communion and fellowship with God. He seems to be conscious of this capacity within His own soul, and believes that it is latent in all men. The psychological basis for it was suggested in a previous chapter. Jesus believes the personality of man to be open to God through more direct channels than the sense organs. The Spirit of God can enter into a man's inner life, and dwell there. Every man is capable of such communion. Inasmuch as fellowship and communion with God is one of the blessings of salvation, it is evident that salvation, or, viewed from the present angle, sonship is impossible without this capacity.

This review of the qualities necessary for sonship

makes it clear that Jesus believes that they are latent in all men. All are not sons of God, but all are capable of doing their part in such a relationship.

(D). The Characteristics of Actual Sonship.

Having reached the conclusion that all men have the qualities necessary to enable them to become sons of God, the next problem which arises is: What are the characteristics of actual sonship? that is, what is the essential difference between a man who is capable of becoming a son of God, and the same man after he has entered into that relationship? If the question asked were: how does a man become a son of God? the answer, of course, would be: through repentance and faith. But what are the characteristics of a man who through repentance and faith has entered the kingdom and become a son? It would be easy to allow a consideration of these characteristics to develop into a discussion of the attributes of a righteous man, but to do so would be to misunderstand the teaching of Jesus. For Him, sonship, like Fatherhood, is not a matter of qualities of character but of attitudes. The true son of God is one who, having entered the kingdom through repentance and faith, has a proper attitude toward all things connected with his new life. This attitude has two aspects - an active and a

passive.

(a). The active aspect of sonship is unselfish aggressive love. It is embodying the ideal of the kingdom of God. It involves loving God with all one's heart, soul, strength, and mind, and loving one's neighbor as one's self. Love is its essential element. Thus Jesus says: "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; "that ye may be the sons of your Father which is in heaven:" "for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, "and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt.5:44-45). In these verses, it is evident that He means that the essence of sonship is identical with the essence of Fatherhood, that is, it is unselfish love. Not the type that loves those who love in return, but rather the kind that loves hoping for no return - the kind that loves enemies and friends alike. Professor Stevens accepts this interpretation when he says: "Jesus teaches His disciples "to love all men, even their enemies. In so doing, they "show themselves to be sons of God, that is, like God.... "Here the argument is simply this: Sonship to God consists in moral likeness to the Father; love all men, "whether good or bad, for that is what the Father does."¹

1. G.B. Stevens, 'The Theology of the New Testament', p.70.

This way of regarding sonship is characteristic of Jesus' way of thinking of all the relationships of life. We have seen that the essence of Fatherhood is to act in a Father-like manner; in the same way, the essence of sonship is to act like a son, and the essence of being a neighbor is to act as a neighbor should. Thus, when a certain lawyer asks Jesus, "Who is my neighbor" Jesus replies by telling the story of the good Samaritan, and finishes by asking: "Which of these three thinkest thou, "proved neighbor unto him that fell among the robbers?" (Lk.10:25-37). Being a neighbor is not a matter of geographical location, but of attitude taken toward one's fellow's.

The attitude of love involved in the active aspect of sonship has the three elements characteristic of all states of mind:

(1). The cognitive element is a recognition of the lovable qualities in both God and man. Love cannot operate in an intellectual vacuum; consequently Jesus' teaching about God and man was an effort to supply the knowledge necessary before love could be possible.

(2). The affective element is a feeling of love toward God and one's fellow men. This feeling is usually regard-

ed as the basic element in love, and, in one sense, it is; yet feeling is impossible without the cognitive and conative elements.

(3). The conative element in the active aspect of sonship is, of course, transforming one's knowledge and love into actual deeds of love. One cannot love God without worshipping Him and trying to do His will, and one cannot love his fellow men without doing unto them as he would desire them to do unto him.

The psychological elements involved in the attitude of love toward one's fellow men will be considered more in detail in the next chapter. It will be noted, however, that the elements in the active aspect of sonship are similar to those in faith.

(b). The passive aspect of sonship is an attitude of willing acceptance of everything that may be in accord with God's sovereign will. It is possible to over-emphasize the active aspect of sonship. We may assume that an entirely unselfish love of God and our fellow men is all that God desires of any man. In the broadest sense, this may be true; for if a man truly loves God, he will express his love by faithful obedience to the Divine will. But there is **danger** that, in over-emphasizing the active element

in love, the passive may be ignored. A man may feel that so long as he is living a life of loving service for God and his fellow men, he can do it in his own way. He accepts from God the general principle which is to guide his conduct, but he reserves for himself the right to determine the details. He is willing to be an instrument by which God works, but not an instrument through which He works. Jesus insists that true sonship involves complete surrendering of one's self to God. It is not only active love, but self-effacing, self-sacrificing love. Thus He teaches men to pray "Thy will be done" (Matt.6:10); He says: "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Mk.3:35); and in His final agony in the garden of Gethsemane, He prays, "not My will, but thine, be done" (Lk.22:42). These verses make it clear that sonship may involve, not only acting in unselfish love toward God and man, but also being willing to be acted upon as God's purposes may require. It is the acceptance of God's will as final, whatever the cost, together with the recognition that, inasmuch as God is a loving Father to all men, all things will eventually work together for good to all those who love and trust Him.

Needless to say, the passive aspect of sonship

also has its psychological elements.

(1). The cognitive element is the recognition that God's love is so perfect that one can trust one's self and all that one holds dear, completely and unreservedly to Him.

(2). The affective element is the feeling of trust in God and His goodness.

(3). The conative element is the act of willingly surrendering one's own will with all its interests and desires to the will of God.

Again, it will be seen that the psychological elements in the passive aspect of sonship are included in those discussed under faith. The attitude which makes it possible for a man to enter the kingdom of God is practically identical with that which constitutes sonship to God.

Summary:

In this chapter we have approached Jesus' conception of man from a different angle. We have shown that, although He often thinks of God's relationship with man in terms of a King and his kingdom, yet that is not the only analogy which He uses. The family idea is found throughout the Synoptics. The two conceptions are closely inter-

woven, and yet they are quite distinct. The family idea, like that of the kingdom, has its source in the Old Testament, although it receives little emphasis there. Its chief expression in the teaching of Jesus is in the word "Father". God is spoken of in the Synoptics as the Father of all men, and the meaning of Fatherhood seems to be "an attitude of unmerited, bountiful, forgiving love." Taking up the conception of man's sonship to God, we have shown that Jesus believes that some men are God's sons, but that sonship is not universal. We have considered the qualities which make men potential sons of God, and have found them to be: (1) a capacity for knowledge of spiritual things, (2) a capacity for moral judgment, (3) the ability to love the right and the good, (4) freedom to choose the right when it has become known and loved, and (5) a capacity for direct communion and fellowship with God. We have pointed out that the characteristics of actual sonship are both active and passive: The active aspect is an attitude of unselfish, aggressive love similar to the attitude in God which makes Him a Father, and the passive aspect is an attitude of self-effacing, self-sacrificing love which is willing to accept and obey the will of God whatever the personal cost. Finally, we have analyzed the psychological

elements in these two aspects of sonship, and have found that they are practically identical with those involved in faith.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MANI. Introduction.

(a). The family idea involves the conception of brotherhood.

(b). The use of the words 'brother' and 'brethren' in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus.

(c). Jesus thinks of men as brothers in two senses.

II. The Brotherhood of Man in the Universal Sense.

(A). The Conception of Brotherhood in the Universal Sense.

(B). The Basis of Universal Brotherhood.

(a). All men are creatures of God.

(b). All belong to the same race.

(c). All share in God's Fatherly attitude.

(d). All have the qualities which will enable them to become brothers in the higher sense.

III. The Brotherhood of Man in the Higher Sense.

(A). The Synoptic use of the words 'brother' and 'brethren' in the higher sense.

(B). The Characteristics of Brotherhood in the Higher Sense.

(a). Brotherhood, like sonship, is essentially an attitude of mind, and has both active and passive aspects.

(b). The Active Aspect of Brotherhood in the Higher Sense.

The all-inclusive characteristic of this aspect of brotherhood is an attitude of love toward all men.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

- (1) Its cognitive element is an understanding of the needs of others and how to supply them.
- (2) Its affective element is a feeling of love for one's fellow men. Not merely an attitude of good-will.
- (3) Its conative element is service.

(c). The Passive Aspect of Brotherhood in the Higher Sense.

The all-inclusive passive quality of brotherhood is an attitude of receptiveness toward the good intentions and kindly efforts of others.

- (1) The cognitive element in the passive aspect of brotherhood is the recognition that others need to love as well as to be loved.
- (2) The affective element is a feeling of love for one's fellow men deep enough to lead one to be willing to be loved by them.
- (3) The conative is the giving of an opportunity to one's fellows to express their love in action.

IV. The Relation between Those who are Brothers in the Higher Sense and Those who are Not.

(A). The distinction between the natural and the redeemed man has been assumed throughout our study. Our main interest has been in the process by which the unredeemed man may become redeemed. All men do not take advantage of the means of salvation; consequently it is necessary to study the relation between the two groups. The two groups are mingled in society.

(B). The Difference Between the Ideal and the Actual Relationship of the Two Types of Brothers.

(a). Ideally, the relationship is one of love and good-will.

(b). Actually it is one of conflict and hostility caused by those who have not learned the significance of true brotherhood.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

(c). This hostility is due to the fact that men identify themselves with their ideals, and, when these ideals are condemned, they feel insulted personally.

V. The Influence of the Two Types of Brothers on Each Other.

(a). The lower type of brothers influences the higher by:

- {1} Tempting them to sin.
- {2} Inducing them to compromise with evil.

(b). The higher type of brothers influences the lower by:

- (1) Exerting a preservative, purifying, and seasoning influence.
- (2) Offering them an example, a guide for conduct, and a source of inspiration.
- (3) Seeking to win them to the higher type of brotherhood.

Summary of Chapter.

CHAPTER XII.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MANI. Introduction.

(a). It was pointed out in the last chapter that the family idea involves, not only the Fatherhood of God and the sonship of man, but also the brotherhood of man. If the family analogy is to have any meaning, men cannot be sons of God without being at the same time brothers to one another. The present chapter will seek to analyze Jesus' conception of this brotherhood.

(b). The word 'brother' (ἀδελφός) occurs twenty-one times in the Synoptics- thirteen on the lips of Jesus, and in none of these instances is it used in the biological sense only, the word 'brethren' (ἀδελφοί) occurs twenty-

nine times of which sixteen are in the sayings of Jesus; but in some of these cases, He uses the word in such manner that it is difficult to know how wide a meaning He intends to put into it. In most of them, however, it is evident that He means something other than the children of the same earthly father.

(c). Our study of man as a son of God would lead us to expect Jesus to speak of men as brothers in two senses other than the biological one. As all men are sons of God in a potential sense, so all would be brothers in a similar way; and as some men attain sonship in a higher, more complete sense, so some would be brothers in this special way. Our analysis of brotherhood will reveal that these expectations are in accord with the facts.

II. The Brotherhood of Man in the Universal sense.

(A). In the first place, as was suggested above, Jesus sometimes speaks of men as brothers in an universal sense. All men are to be regarded as brethren whether or not they are sons of God. Thus professor Wendt says: "The term brother is applied to men independently of whether or not they comport themselves as becomes members of God's kingdom. In the passages where Jesus forbids words and deeds of hatred to a brother, and requires rather kindly remonstrance with and forgiveness of an erring brother, we must by no means restri

"the application of the term brother to co-members of the
 "kingdom of God."¹ The passages spoken of here are Matthew
 5:22-24, 7:3, 18:21,35, 25:40, and Luke 6:41, 42, 17:3.

These verses speak of men in such a broad and general way
 that there can be little doubt but that all men are included.

(B). The Basis of Universal Brotherhood.

The ground upon which all men are called brothers
 is undoubtedly the fact that all are human beings. The
 qualities which make a man a brother in this sense are in
 him as a man; he cannot attain them, and he cannot lose
 them; They lie entirely outside the realm of the moral
 and spiritual activity of the men concerned.

(a) In the first place, men are brothers because God has
 created them. He is their Father in the sense of the ulfi-
 mate source from which they spring, and they are brothers
 because they share this common origin.

(b) Again, men are brothers because they belong to the
 same race. We have seen that in all probability Jesus
 accepts the general historical truth of the creation stor-
 ies; consequently He believes that all men are descended from
 a common ancestor. Inasmuch then as all are sons of Adam,
 it is natural to think of all as brothers.

(c) In the third place, all men are brothers because God

 1. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol I, p. 338.

takes a Fatherly attitude toward all. That is, they are brothers in a sense of being blessed by a common Father-love. In the broadest sense, the family of God may be thought of as existing because of God's Fatherly attitude toward men whether or not men respond to this attitude.

(d). Finally, all men are brothers because they have the qualities which will enable them to become brothers in the higher sense of brotherhood. That is, they are brothers because they share the potentialities of spiritual and ethical brotherhood. These potentialities are practically the same as those required in order that a man may become a son in the higher sense. The reason for this is clear when we remember that brotherhood and sonship are not two entirely different things, but the same thing viewed from different angles. A son in the higher sense is a God-like man viewed primarily in his relationship to his Father in Heaven, whereas a brother is the same individual viewed in his relationship with his fellow men.

Having satisfied ourselves that Jesus believes all men to be brothers in the lower sense, and having analyzed the qualities on which this type of brotherhood is based, we shall next consider Jesus conception of the higher type of brotherhood.

III. The Brotherhood of Man in the Higher Sense.

(A). As was suggested above, Jesus' use of the words brother or brethren in the Synoptics leaves no room to doubt that He not only spoke of men as brothers in the universal sense which has been considered, but also in a much narrower, and from an ethical standpoint, much nobler sense. To quote again from Wendt: "Jesus recognizes as "His brother, in a peculiar sense, one who does the will "of God, and also the disciples of Jesus afterwards especially regarded and called the fellow members of the "Christian community their brethren."¹ Jesus uses the word 'brethren' in this higher sense in Matthew 5:47, 12:48-49, 23:8, 28:10, Mk,3:33,34, and Lk.8:21. The word 'brother' is used in this way in Matthew 12:50 only. Or, at least, that is the only instance where the meaning is beyond doubt, but this is probably due to the fact that Jesus had fewer occasions to use the word in the singular.

(B). The Characteristics of Brotherhood in the Higher Sense.

(a). As was previously pointed out, a son in the ideal sense is a God-like man viewed primarily in his relationship with His Father in heaven, whereas a brother is the

1. Wendt, 'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol.I, p.338.

same individual viewed in his relationship with his fellow men. Inasmuch as this is true, we may expect that brotherhood, like sonship, will be essentially an attitude of mind rather than a group of mental attributes, and that it will have both an active and a passive aspect. This is undoubtedly true of Jesus' conception of brotherhood.

(b). The Active Aspect of Brotherhood in the Higher Sense.

The all-inclusive characteristic of the active aspect of brotherhood in the higher sense is an attitude of love toward all men. Although no direct testimony on the point can be found in the Synoptics, it is undoubtedly involved in the interpretation which we have seen that Jesus gave to the ideas of Fatherhood, sonship, and neighborliness. If Fatherhood is essentially a matter of acting like a Father, sonship of behaving like a son, and neighborliness of treating others as a neighbor ought to treat them, then being a brother would undoubtedly mean adopting an attitude of brotherly love toward all.

We have seen that every mental state has three psychological elements; consequently we may expect to find these elements either directly suggested or implied in

Jesus' teaching about brotherliness.

(1). The cognitive element in the active aspect of brotherliness would naturally be an understanding of the needs of others and how to supply them. Just as sonship is impossible without knowledge of God, so an attitude of brotherly love cannot exist without some knowledge of one's fellows and their needs. Thus, when Jesus teaches that brotherliness requires feeding the hungry and giving water to the thirsty, it is assumed that the one who is to act in a brotherly manner must first know that his fellows are hungry and thirsty, and understand how to get food and drink for them. In the same way, when a man is urged to forgive his enemy, it is taken for granted that he knows the offense which his enemy has committed, and the reasons why it is an offense.

(2). The affective element in the active aspect of true brotherliness is a feeling of love for one's fellow men. In our study of sonship, we found that the affective element in the attitude of sonship is a feeling of love both for God and man. Brotherhood differs from sonship in that, although it always assumes a love of God, yet it is primarily concerned with the love of one's fellow men only.

It is sometimes urged that a feeling element in

love toward one's fellow men - one's enemies in particular - is difficult if not impossible; and that, when Jesus teaches that men should love their enemies, He means only that they should have an attitude of good-will toward them. This contention seems to be out of harmony with the teaching of Jesus. He held that the standard of love for one's fellow men is the attitude of God toward His children. This attitude is not merely one of good-will, but it is described by the Fourth Evangelist as a love so great that God sacrificed "His only begotten Son" (Jn.3:16); it is a love that leads to rejoicing in heaven when a sinner repents (Lk.15:10), and causes the Father to run to meet His returning sons when they are "yet a great way off" (Lk.15:20). If God's love for men is the standard of their love for one another, it cannot be argued that the requirement of brotherhood is merely good-will. Brotherhood in the highest sense demands that man's love should be perfect even as the Father's love is perfect (Matt.5:48).

(3). The conative element in the active aspect of brotherhood is service. To be a true brother, one needs not only to understand his fellows and to love them, but to do all he can to be of service to them. The emphasis on

service to others is very great in the teaching of Jesus. In contrast to those conceptions of religion which have induced men to withdraw from the society of their fellows and lead lives consecrated to God, Jesus teaches that the highest reverence for God requires devotion to one's fellow men. He does not hold that service to man can take the place of service to God - God must be first - but He contends that no true devotion to God is possible that does not include service for one's fellows. Thus, in the judgment scene in Matthew, He pictures the King as saying to those who have acted kindly toward their fellows, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me" (Matt.25:40). Service is the natural consummation of the active aspect of brotherly love.

(c). The Passive Aspect of Brotherhood in the Higher Sense.

As was suggested above, brotherhood, like sonship, has a passive as well as an active aspect. The all-inclusive passive quality of brotherhood is an attitude of receptiveness toward the good intentions and kindly efforts of others. This is not something entirely different from active brotherly love, but the passive aspect of it. The

active side of brotherly love is, of course, the most essential one. It is possible for A to be a brother to B without B being a brother to A. But, although this is true, the ideal brotherhood is a reciprocal relationship. It involves an exchange of kindness, and such an exchange is only possible when each party is willing to receive favors as well as to give them.

The need for such a quality in brotherliness is seen when one remembers that nothing is more disagreeable to a self-respecting person than to be the recipient of the kindness of others without having an opportunity to respond. The resentment of poor people toward the benevolence of the wealthy is frequently due to the fact that charity is given in such manner that no opportunity is offered to do anything in return. Such charity may be benevolence, but it is not brotherliness. We shall see that Jesus constantly recognizes that true brotherliness involves not only an active attitude toward others but also giving others an opportunity to return our kindness.

(1). The cognitive element in the passive aspect of brotherhood is the recognition that others need to love as well as to be loved. As was suggested above, benevolence falls short of true brotherliness because, although it may

express the good-will of the giver, yet it gives no recognition to the fact that the one receiving it needs an opportunity to respond. Jesus believes that true brotherliness involves loving others in such a way that they can love us in return. A man may be a brother to his fellows without getting any response to his love, but he cannot be a brother without desiring one and recognizing that his fellows need to make such a response.

(2). The affective element in the passive aspect of brotherhood involves a feeling of love for our fellows deep enough to lead us to be willing to be loved by them. The significance of this idea is seen when we remember that it is possible to preform acts of kindness to men, whose love, if it were offered in return, would be resented. The proud Pharisee may give alms to the poor, but he never dreams of offering them the kind of love that invites a personal response. True brotherhood, however, involves a desire for reciprocity in love. It has no place for castes or artificial levels of society. Jesus makes this clear when He mingles with publicans and sinners (Mk.2:15-16, Matt.9:10-11, Lk.5:29-30). If He who knows Himself to be the noblest of God's sons recognizes that men need to love as well as to be loved, and offers Himself

to the humblest for that purpose, surely no ordinary man can be above such fellowship. It is to be observed, however, that when Jesus mingles with sinners recognizing their need to love and offering Himself as the object of that love, He does not stoop to their plane, but seeks to lift them to His. In the same way, the highest type of brotherhood involves seeking a brotherly response from one's fellows, not by lowering one's self to their level, but by drawing them up to one's own.

(3). The conative element in the passive aspect of brotherhood is the giving of an opportunity to one's fellows to express their brotherly love in action. The kind of love which takes great pride in doing things for others, but is too proud to allow others to do anything in return, is not love at all, but selfishness. Jesus recognizes this when He allows certain women to respond to His deeds of love by providing of their substance for the personal needs of Himself and His disciples (Lk.8:3); He rebukes those who would have prevented the woman who came with the box of precious ointment from expressing her love and devotion in the only way that was open to her (Mk.14:3-9, Matt.26:6-13); and He highly commends a poor widow, who cast her last two mites into the treasury, not because God

needed her gift, but because she needed to give it (Mk. 12:42-44, Lk.21:1-4). It is evident then that brotherliness cannot attain its highest goal unless a man gives his fellows an opportunity to respond to his deeds of love in ways suited to their nature and ability.

The foregoing study of the meaning of brotherhood has shown that Jesus thought of men as brothers in two different senses: All men are brothers in the sense that all bear the common characteristics of humanity, but only a limited number are brothers in the sense of realizing the higher significance of brotherhood and actually having the brotherly attitude toward their fellows. The last problem that requires our attention in this connection is the relation between the two types of brotherhood.

IV. The Relation Between Those who are Brothers in the Higher Sense and Those who are Not.

(A). As was suggested in the opening chapter and has been evident throughout our study, a distinction between the natural and the redeemed man is assumed in all the teaching of Jesus. The greater part of our study has been concerned with these two classes of men, and the means of passing from the former group into the latter. Jesus recognizes, however, that, although it is desirable that all

unredeemed men should be redeemed, yet in actual practice this ideal is never reached, Many may pass from one group into the other, yet the two classes still remain. Because this is true, our study would not be complete if we did not give some consideration to His ideas regarding the relationship which exists between the members of these two classes. The point might be discussed with equal propriety under the heading of the relationship between the members of the kingdom and those who are not members, but it is more expedient to consider it here.

If Jesus had believed that the two groups would be kept entirely separate in this world, our problem would not have arisen; but the Synoptics make it clear that He does not expect any such separation to take place. In the parable of the tares and the wheat, both grow together until the harvest, and the separation does not come until after the growth is completed (Matt.13:24-30). Likewise in the parable of the net which gathers every kind, no separation takes place until after the gathering (Matt.13:47-50). In addition to these explicit references, there are many things in the teaching of Jesus that imply such a relationship. Some of these will be considered in our discussion of the points which follow.

(B). The Difference between the Ideal and the Actual Relationship of the Two Types of Brothers.

(a). Ideally, the relation, which exists between those who are brothers to their fellows in the higher sense of the word and those who are not, is one of love and good-will. If love begets love, and good-will begets good-will, if kindness produces kindness, and mercy is the product of mercy, then the two types of brothers should live together on terms of closest understanding. Jesus teaches His followers, not only to love one another, but also to love their enemies (Matt.5:43-48). They are to be merciful to all (Matt.5:7), humble and meek (Matt.5:5), respectful of the integrity of other men's families (Matt.5:8,28), and good to their neighbors (Lk.10:30-37). In fact they are to put into practice what would seem to be an ideal rule to create good feeling, that is, they are to do unto others as they would have others do unto them (Matt.7:12). Surely, if they behave in that manner, the world will receive them with open arms.

(b). As a matter of fact, however, Jesus realizes that this ideal will not be attained in practice. Instead of love and good-will between the two types of brothers, the actual relationship will be one of conflict and hostility

caused in the main by those who have not learned the true significance of brotherhood.

The Synoptics give us considerable evidence for this truth. In sending out His disciples on a missionary journey, Jesus warns them of the hostility and persecution that they are certain to encounter. They are to go forth as "sheep in the midst of wolves" (Matt.10:16); they are to "beware of men" (Matt.10:17); they are to be delivered up and brought "before governors and kings" (Matt.10:18); and they are to be persecuted for their righteousness (Matt. 5:10). But not only must they fear organized persecution, but their loyalty to the things of God will result in individual opposition. Thus Jesus says: "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household" (Matt.10: 34-36). These verses make it clear that He believed that the relationship between the two types of brothers, although ideally one of love and good-will, would actually be one of hostility and conflict.

(c). When we seek for an understanding of this hostility

where love would seem to be in order, we do not find it difficult to explain. It is caused by the fact that loyalty to the higher type of brotherhood involves an attitude of hostility toward all lesser ideals. But men tend to identify themselves with ideals, even to embody them; consequently, to show hostility toward the things with which they have identified themselves is to give them the impression either of being hostile or, at least, unsympathetic toward them personally. Thus when Jesus opposes the ideals of the Pharisees, they hate Him in spite of the fact that He loves them; and later, when Paul, driven by a love for Gentiles, goes on his missionary journeys, he frequently meets with opposition because men interpret his denunciation of their sins as a denunciation of themselves. If a man's life is organized around low ideals, and consequently he is living a life of sin, he ought to be thankful when someone seeks to show him a better way, but Jesus knows practical psychology too well to expect any such thing actually to take place. He believes that real brotherly love requires a man to oppose sin in others, and that such opposition is in itself an act of love; but His own experience with the religious leaders of His day is too real to His mind to allow Him to suppose that others will inter-

pret opposition in that way. Because this is true, He realizes that He Himself will suffer at the hands of His fellows, and that His followers will be forced to "drink "the same cup".

V. The Influence of the Two Types of Brothers on Each Other.

But, although Jesus expects that those who do not have the brotherly attitude toward their fellows will be hostile toward those who do have it, yet He does not believe that this hostility will prevent the two groups from influencing one another.

(a). On the one hand, He recognizes that those who have not attained the higher type of brotherhood will have an evil influence on those who are trying to attain it. They are the tares among the wheat; they retard its growth, and make its struggle for life more difficult. The methods which they use are of two types.

(1). First, they tempt their more righteous brothers to sin. This point was discussed in our study of the source of temptation; consequently it is only necessary to point out here that Jesus believes that sinful men have a powerful influence for evil. No command that He gives His disciples has greater significance than the warning that they

should beware of the teaching of the Pharisees and the Sadducees (Matt.16:11-12).

(2). In the second place, the hostility which is certain to result from rebuking sin leads to a danger which Jesus does not fail to recognize. It is that men will be persuaded by the opposition of their fellows to compromise with evil. They will not do their utmost in the battle with sin because they fear hostility and persecution. It should be noted that Jesus regards these two evils as certain (Matt. 10:16,23, 23:34, 13:21, Mk.4:17, Lk.11:49, 21:12). They will not come to a limited number only and they will not be due to peculiar conditions which happen to exist in the day in which Jesus lives; but they will be universal because sin is universal, and the necessity of combatting it, universal. It is not surprizing then that Jesus fears the danger of compromise, and that He pronounces a special blessing on those who are able to resist it (Matt.5:10-12).

(b). On the other hand, although He recognizes that those who are not brothers in the higher sense will have a great influence on those who are, yet He also believes that those who are brothers in the higher sense will have a powerful influence on those who are not. "The virtues inherent in "true discipleship are such that they cannot fail to exert

"a beneficent influence on the world, even apart from any
"direct effort towards this end."¹ This influence is of
several kinds.

(1). First, Jesus seems to have expected that those who were brothers in the higher sense would have a preservative, purifying, and seasoning influence on their fellows. Thus, He calls His disciples the "salt of the earth" (Matt.5:13). We cannot place too much dependence in a figure of speech, but there can be little doubt that He means to suggest that His disciples (and they may be regarded as representatives of the higher type of brotherhood) will be an essential element in the future society. They will preserve it from moral and spiritual decay, purify it from evil, and give it a seasoning flavor without which life would be almost intolerable.

(2). Again, as we have seen, Jesus calls His disciples "the light of the world" (Matt.5:14). The goodness of God is to shine in them as in a lamp that men may see their good works and glorify God (Matt.5:16). The idea undoubtedly is that, by embodying God's Spirit and doing God's will, they are to be an example to others, a guide to their conduct, and a source of inspiration and uplift. They are

1. John M. King, 'The Theology of Christ's Teaching', p.257.

to be like leaven "which a woman took and hid in three "measures of meal, till it was all leavened" (Matt.13:33). In other words, although they are to mingle with society, they are not to become like society, but they are to make society like themselves.

(3). The idea of making society like themselves suggests the last influence which Jesus expects those who are brothers in the higher sense to have on their fellows. That is, they are to have a part in their salvation; they are to win them to true brotherhood; they are to be "fish-ers" of men (Matt.4:19). This point was discussed when we considered the ways in which man co-operates with Christ in giving the salvation of the kingdom of God, so it needs no further elaboration.

Summary:

This chapter completes our study of the family idea in the teaching of Jesus. We have found that Jesus not only speaks of God as 'Father' and man as 'son', but also of men as 'brothers'. We have considered His use of the terms 'brother' and 'brethren', and have found that they are used in two senses. In a lower sense, all men are brothers, whereas, in a higher and more ethical sense, only

those are called brothers who have the brotherly attitude. The basis of universal brotherhood is the fact that all men are human beings. All are created by God, belong to the same race, share in God's Fatherly attitude, and have the potentialities of the higher type of brotherhood. In considering brotherhood in the higher ethical sense. we have pointed out that, inasmuch as a son in the ideal sense is a God-like man viewed primarily in his relationship to his Father in heaven, so a brother is the same individual viewed in his relationship with his fellow men. We have seen further that the higher type of brotherhood has two aspects - active and passive, and that each of these aspects has the three psychological elements common to all states of consciousness. The all-inclusive characteristic of the active aspect of brotherhood in the higher sense is an attitude of brotherly love toward all men. The cognitive element in this attitude is an understanding of the needs of our fellows and how to supply them; the affective element is a feeling of love for one's fellow men; and the conative element is service. The all-inclusive quality in the passive aspect of brotherhood is an attitude of receptiveness toward the good intentions and kindly efforts of others. The cognitive element in this attitude is a

recognition that others need to love as well as to be loved; the affective element is a feeling of love for one's fellows deep enough to lead one to be willing to be loved by them; and the conative element is the giving of an opportunity to one's fellows to express their love in action. The last part of the chapter has been given to the study of the relation between the two types of brothers. We have pointed out that this relation might be studied with equal propriety under the heading of the relation between the redeemed and the unredeemed, or between the members of the kingdom of God and the non-members. We have shown that the problem arises because the two types of people are mingled in society. The ideal relationship between them is one of love and good-will, but the actual relationship is one of hostility on the part of those who are not brothers in the higher sense toward those who are. In spite of this hostility, the lower type of brothers influences the higher by tempting them to sin, and inducing them, through persecution, to compromise with evil; and, at the same time, the higher type of brothers influences the lower by exerting a preservative, purifying, and seasoning influence on their lives, by offering them an example, a guide of conduct, and a source of inspiration, and by

seeking to induce them to become brothers in the higher sense.

MAN'S WORTH TO GODI. Introduction.

(a). Review of preceding chapters and statement of final problem - the making of a general estimate of man's worth and significance in the eyes of God.

II. The Basis of Man's Value and Worth to God.

(A). The basis laid in our previous study.

(a). Man is a creature of God.

(b). He is made in the image of God.

(c). He has in him the qualities necessary for sonship.

(d). Viewed from another angle, the ultimate basis of man's worth to God is God's love for man.

(B). The significance of the above basis of value.

(a). All men share in this value.

(b). It is a value that cannot be lost by sin.

III. The Ways in which Jesus Shows His Estimate of Man's Worth to God.

(A). It is shown by a series of comparisons. Man is worth more than:

(a). Anything in the vegetable world.

(b). Any animal.

(c). Any institution, human or Divine.

{1} The Sabbath.

{2} The Law.

{3} Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the Church, government
etc

MAN'S WORTH TO GOD

(B). It is shown by Jesus' attitude toward various groups of men.

(a). Publicans and sinners.

(b). The poor.

(c). Women.

(d). Children.

(e). The Gentiles.

(C). It is shown by God's concern for men.

(a). His providential care.

(b). His yearning for man's salvation.

(c). His sending of His Son as the Messiah.

(d). His regarding service to man as equivalent to service to God.

(D). It is shown by the fact that Jesus speaks of God in human terms.

Summary and Conclusion.

The importance and value of man in the universe is second only to God Himself. Man shares with God in the realm of ultimate ends.

CHAPTER XIII

MAN'S WORTH TO GODI. Introduction.

(a). In the preceding chapters we have considered Jesus' conception of man as a religious being. We have studied the psychology of man, his moral freedom, and the sinfulness of his unredeemed state. We have noted that throughout His teaching Jesus thinks of men as belonging to two groups - the redeemed and the unredeemed. We have shown that He believes that it is possible for men to pass from one group into the other; the unredeemed man in his state of sinfulness is capable of being saved. We have pointed out that the conception of salvation is predetermined to a great extent by the evils from which men need to be

saved; and have shown that Jesus usually presents His view of salvation under the form of the kingdom of God. We have studied the relative responsibility of God and man in the process of salvation, and have concluded that, although man has a part to play in saving himself, and is entirely responsible for that part, yet the chief responsibility for salvation is on God. We have considered whether the salvation of the kingdom is open to all men, and have concluded that Jesus makes no distinction between Jew and Gentile. Because of the contention of the modern eschatological school that the kingdom of God is entirely future, we have considered the various theories regarding the time of the coming of the kingdom, and have concluded that it is both present and future in harmony with the analogy of a growing crop. Taking up the idea of the kingdom of God, we have found that Jesus believes it to mean essentially the rule of God in the human heart, and we have pointed out in detail how He expects this rule to save men both in this present life and in the life which follows physical death. We have considered what man can do to receive this salvation, and have found that, although he can do nothing to earn it, yet he can appropriate it through repentance and faith. We have studied Jesus con-

ception of how God makes the salvation of the kingdom available for men, and have found that He believes that He Himself is to be God's chief agent in establishing the kingdom, and that His methods are to be the same essentially as those of the Servant of Jehovah in Deutero-Isaiah. Finally, we have considered the family idea in the teaching of Jesus, and have found that He believes God to be the Father of all men because He has the Fatherly attitude toward all. We have studied His conception of sonship and brotherhood, and have found that the distinction between the redeemed and the unredeemed is to be seen here also, and that it divides men into two classes of sons and two classes of brothers.

In order to complete our study of Jesus' conception of man, one thing further is needed, Using our previous study as a background, we must seek to determine His general estimate of the worth and significance of man in the eyes of God - his value and importance in the Divine plan for the world.

II. The Basis of Man's Value and Worth to God.

(A). The basis for an understanding of Jesus' conception of the worth and significance of man in the eyes of God

has been laid by our previous study.

(a). In the first place, we found that Jesus teaches that man is a creature of God. This fact in itself is sufficient to make him of great value in God's sight. God would not have created him had He not had some valuable end which would be secured by his existence.

(b), But not only did God create man, but He created him in His own image. The whole world is on a level so far as the mere fact of creation is concerned, but man alone has the honor of being made in the image of God. But if man is made in God's image, that is an additional and compelling reason why he should be of great value to God. Dr. Walker goes so far as to suggest that it is the chief reason: "The idea of the image of God in man is the basis of those sayings of Jesus which imply the unique value of man¹ to God."

(c). Although being created in the image of God is sufficient in itself to make man of great value in the eyes of God, yet there can be no doubt but that Jesus feels this value to be increased by the fact that man has in him the qualities necessary for sonship. Among all God's creatures man alone has within him possibilities which enable him to

1. Thomas Walker, 'The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age', p.211.

rise to the level of fellowship with his Creator and to call Him 'Father'.

(d). While, in one sense, the basis of man's value to God is to be found in the qualities inherent in the man himself, in another, it lies entirely in God. It is conceivable that, in spite of the fact that man is a creature of God, created in His image, and having within him the possibilities of sonship. God might be entirely indifferent toward him. Because this is true, the ultimate basis of man's value to God is God's love for man. It is more than a pride of workmanship, or the possession of common qualities; it is the sense of worth which always accompanies personal affection.

(B). Before proceeding to the study of the specific teaching of Jesus with reference to man's worth to God, the significance of such a basis of value as we have considered should be pointed out.

(a). In the first place, if man's worth to God is based on God's love for man, and this love has its basis in the fact that man is a creature of God, bears the image of God, and has within him the qualities necessary in order to become a son of God, it is evident that all men share in this value, for all have these characteristics. There is no

suggestion in the teaching of Jesus that God loves one man more than another, or that one more than the other is made in the image of God or possesses the potentialities of sonship. On the contrary, all share alike in the qualities which give them worth in God's sight. The humblest peasant is as valuable as the noblest lord or the most powerful king. It might be argued that those who attain sonship in the higher sense are dearer to God than those who do not, but even this supposition is made doubtful by the fact that Jesus says: "there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons, which need no repentance". (Lk. 15: 7).

(b). But if all men are valuable in God's sight, and their value has such a basis as we have described, it is evident that this value cannot be lost by sin. This is the secret of Jesus' work among sinners. He recognizes that, no matter how low a man may sink, he continues to be a creature of God, made in God's image with the qualities necessary in order to become a real son of God, and God still loves him. The foulest sinner in the depths of sin retains the infinite worth in the sight of God that is inherent in him as a man.

III. The Ways in which Jesus Showed His Estimate of Man's Worth to God.

Jesus' estimate of the worth of man in the eyes of God is revealed in the Synoptics in a number of different ways.

(A). In the first place, He teaches the value of man by a series of comparisons. He speaks of things which sometimes have great value in the eyes of men, and points out that, in God's sight, man is much more important.

(a). First, man is of greater value to God than any thing in the vegetable world. Jesus makes no direct statement to this effect, but He clearly implies it in Matthew 6:28-30 when, after speaking of the beauty of the lilies of the field, He says: "If God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you?" The point under consideration is not man's value, yet, incidentally, Jesus testifies that a flower which is one of the most beautiful and lovely things in all the vegetable world is, in comparison to man, insignificant in God's sight.

(b). Again, Jesus gives a similar testimony regarding the animal world. There are several passages in both Matthew and Luke that apply to this point. First, there

are verses which suggest a comparison of value with the birds of the air. In Matthew 6:26, He says: "Behold the birds of the heaven; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?" In Matthew 10:29-31, He says: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall to the ground without your Father.... Fear not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows." Luke also has versions of these two verses in 12:24 and 12:7 but the differences are unessential. It will be seen that Jesus does not speak of God as the Father of the birds. He is "your Father", and He expressly says that man is of more value than many sparrows. His testimony regarding animals is equally positive. In Matthew 12:11-12, in discussing whether it is proper to heal on the Sabbath day, He says: "What man shall there be of you, that shall have one sheep, and if this fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out? How much then is a man of more value than a sheep?" In similar discussions in Luke 13:15,16, and Luke 14:5, Jesus suggests the same thought but uses oxen and asses instead of sheep. He argues that if the Jews break their rigid Sabbath laws to

bring comfort and satisfaction to animals, it is certainly allowable to break them for the sake of man who is infinitely more important than the animals.

(c). This superiority of the needs of both men and animals over the regulations of the Sabbath, suggests the next group of comparisons by which Jesus teaches the value of man. He believes that man is of greater value than any institution or organization whether human or Divine.

(1). First, as has been suggested, He teaches that man is superior in importance to the Sabbath. In addition to the verses already quoted, we find the following incident in Mark 2:24-28, "And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, "why do they on the Sabbath day that which is not lawful? "And he said unto them, "Did ye never read what David did, "when he had need, and was an hungered, he, and they that were "with him? How he entered into the house of God when Abiathar was high priest, and did eat the shew bread which it is "not lawful to eat save for the priests, and gave also to "them that were with him?" And he said unto them, "The "Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath: So "that the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath." Matthew and Luke have versions of this same incident in Matthew 12: 2-8 and Luke 6:3-5. These verses make it clear that Jesus

regards the Sabbath day, not as something which has sanctity or value in itself, but rather as something which takes its value from the fact that man needs it. He does not encourage a light view of the Sabbath, but insists that it is wrong to hold something which is a mere means to an end more sacred than the end itself.

(2). The same verses also reveal Jesus' estimate of the law. He says that, because they had need of food, David and his followers ate the shew bread which it was not lawful for them to eat. He commends their action, seemingly because He regards the needs of men as superior to the law. Certainly He does not mean to belittle the law - Matthew 5:17 is sufficient to show that He values it highly, but He regards the law as a means to man's highest good. If the end for which the law exists requires it, the law may be suspended temporarily. When once the viewpoint is understood, such facts may be taken for granted.

(3). The principle which emerges here should be applied to all institutions. If the most sacred ones of the day - the Sabbath and the Law - are secondary to man, the same thing must be true of all others - human and Divine. We have seen that Jesus and His disciples practise baptism and that He personally instituted the sacrament of the Lord's

Supper, but these sacraments are intended as means to man's good and are not to be regarded as ends in themselves. There is a passage or two in the Synoptics, which, if authentic, would indicate that He looks forward to the growth of a Church, but it also would be secondary in importance to the disciples who would be gathered into it (Matt.16:18, 18:17). He seems to be patriotic, at least to the extent of recognizing the need of civil government, but if the principles which we have been discussing are true, He cannot have regarded government as anything more than an institution for working out the highest welfare of man. Had He expressed Himself on the matter at all, He would have held that the state exists for the people, and not the people for the state. The modern type of patriotism with its exalted nationalism, which sacrifices millions of the best citizens to the abstraction - national honor, is entirely out of harmony with the teaching of Jesus.

This supremacy of the value of man as an individual over institutions is further indicated not only by the things which Jesus says, but also by those which He does not say. In a day when there is a strong nationalistic feeling, when zealots are urging a revolt against the Roman power, and when one of His disciples is a member, or, at

least, has been a member, of this party. Jesus never discusses the idea. He gives no time to campaigns for law observance, Sabbath observance, or teaching patriotism, not because He disapproves of these things, but because they are means and not ends in themselves, and He needs to spend His time emphasizing ultimate ends.

(B). But not only does Jesus teach the value of man by these various types of comparison, but also by His attitude toward different groups of men. Had He associated exclusively with the highest type of men, it would have indicated that He felt that they and they only were of value in God's sight. But, by mingling with the weak and the ignorant, the poor and the helpless, He shows that all men are precious in the sight of God. As Professor Bruce has said: "By the interest He took in the depraved, Jesus "still further accentuated His doctrine as to the value of "human nature."¹ Not all of the lowly with whom He associates are depraved, but they are people who are regarded by others as unimportant and insignificant, and, by His interest in them, He shows their true value to God.

(a). First, we find that He associates with publicans and other kinds of sinners (Mk.2:15-16, Lk.5:29-30, Matt.9:-----
1. A.B. Bruce, 'The Kingdom of God', p.130.

10,11). He chooses a publican to be one of His disciples (Matt.10:3,,Lk.5:27); He is called the friend of publicans and sinners (Matt.11:19, Lk.7:34); He prophesies that the publicans and the harlots will go into the kingdom of God before the chief priests and elders of the people (Matt.21:23,31); He declares His purpose is not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance (Mk.2:17, Matt.9:13, Lk.5:32), and that He has come to save the lost (Matt.18:11, Lk.19:10). A number of other passages in the Synoptics express the same thought. They emphasize the idea, previously discussed, that all men have qualities which make them of great potential value in the estimation of God, and, however low they may sink in degradation and sin, their value is not lost because they ~~may~~ be redeemed.

(b). In the second place, Jesus testifies to the worth of man by His regard for the poor. To quote again from Professor Bruce: "The prominence given to the poor in the "Gospel of the kingdom, in so far as it had theoretical significance and was not the spontaneous expression of compassion, marked the value set by Jesus on man as man." He mingles with sinners, but is not one of them. He not only mingles with the poor, but He belongs to their group. He -----
1. A.B. Bruce, 'The Kingdom of God', p.129-30.

is born, if the essential truth of the birth records be accepted, in a building used for the shelter of animals; He is reared in a home where poverty would not be unknown; He is the son of a carpenter in a small village; He probably works for a time at his father's trade thereby actively identifying Himself with working men and women; and, during His ministry, He accepts help from devoted followers, and confesses that He does not have a place to lay His head. Thus, if Jesus' assumption of His own worth in the sight of God be admitted, His poverty is a testimony to the fact that the poor are no less valuable to God because they are poor.

Some of His words can be cited to the same effect. In Matthew 11:5, He says: "The poor have good tidings preached to them". In Mark 12:42,43, Luke 21:3, He compares the poor widow who cast her two mites into the treasury with the rich who cast in much larger sums, and finds her to much nobler than any of them. In Lk.6:20, in a passage which may be the original of Matthew 5:3, He says that the kingdom of heaven belongs to the poor. In Luke 14:13, He says that when a feast is given one should not invite his kinsmen or his rich neighbors, but "the poor, "the maimed, the lame, the blind." These verses make it

clear that poverty is in no sense a limitation of a man's value to God.

(c). Again, Jesus' treatment of women is proof of His belief in the great value of man. So far as we can trace the matter in history, the female sex has always been regarded as inferior to the male. In the Old Testament, this idea is shown by the fact that woman is sometimes spoken of as if she were part of the property of her husband (Ex.20:17). The respect for womanhood has greatly increased among the Jewish people by the time of Christ, but women are not regarded as the equal of men. This is indicated by the divorce laws (Mark 10:2-12). Jesus opposes this inequality, and, although He never directly discusses the relative importance of men and women in the sight of God, yet His treatment of women is such as to lead one to think that He believes them to be on a par with men. But if Jesus has such a high regard for that half of the human race which has always been looked upon as inferior, it is clear that He must have a very high estimate of the race as a whole.

(d). The same thing is true with reference to His treatment of children. It is easy to believe in the value of a fully developed character and personality, but there is a

temptation to think of little children as of no great importance. Jesus finds the highest value in little children. Their simple trust sets an ideal for the faith of their elders (Matt.18:3, Mk.10:15, Lk.18:17); to receive a child in Christ's name is equivalent to receiving Christ (Matt.18:5, Lk.9:48, Mk.9:37); and when His disciples rebuke those who bring their little children to Him that He may put His hands on them and pray, He says: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven." (Matt.19:14, Mk.10:14, Lk.18:16). These verses show His high regard for childhood, and, since the child is an undeveloped man, it is clear, not only that He values man very highly, but also that this value exists even in the simplest and least developed personality.

(e). A similar argument may be deduced from His attitude toward the Gentiles, but, inasmuch as this question has received a detailed treatment in a previous chapter, we will merely point out here that He held both Jew and Gentile to be of infinite value in God's sight.

(C). Jesus' conception of man's worth to God is further emphasized by a third type of evidence. He pictures to us a God who is greatly concerned over the welfare and the sal-

vation of men. Such concern can only be explained by the supposition that man has a very high value in God's sight.

(a). In the first place, Jesus reveals God's concern for man by showing that He watches over him with the tenderest love and care. After describing the wonderful beauty that God has woven into a flower, He says, "Shall he not much more clothe you" (Matt.6:30). He teaches that God's love is so great that men need not worry over what they shall eat, or what they shall drink, or the things they shall wear (Matt.6:31); as God feedeth the fowls of the air, so He will feed His children (Matt.6:26). He argues that an earthly father would not give his children stones when they ask bread, or serpents when they ask for fish, and says: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask them?" (Matt.7:9-11). God's care for men is so great that the very hairs of their heads are numbered; consequently men can trust themselves completely to God (Matt. 10:30). A God who takes such interest in man must value him very highly indeed.

(b). Again, Jesus pictures God as yearning for the salvation of man. God's Fatherhood is perfect on its active

side, but it is never fully complete passively until man gives a satisfactory response. Man's worth to God is so great that God is emotionally imperfect until man has responded to His love. These facts are brought out clearly in the three parables in the fifteenth chapter of Luke. In the story of the lost sheep, Jesus describes how the shepherd leaves the ninety-nine which do not stray and searches tirelessly until he finds the one which is lost, and the greatness of his joy over finding it. His conclusion is that "there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons which need no repentance" (Lk.15:7). In the parable of the lost coin, the woman searches diligently and anxiously until she has found it, and then her joy is so great that she calls in her neighbors to rejoice with her (Lk.15:8,9). This also, He says, is a picture of God's joy over the repentance of a sinner. The parable of the prodigal son is, perhaps, the clearest of all, for, when the son has gone into a far country, the father yearns for him and watches anxiously for his return, and when the boy comes, the father sees him when he is yet a great way off, and runs, and falls on his neck and kisses him. In the intensity of his joy over his son's return, he kills the

"fatted calf" and gives a great feast of rejoicing.

Jesus does not draw the inference from the parable, but it is perfectly clear, Man's worth in God's sight is so great that He yearns for his salvation as a father yearns for the return of a wayward son, and He cannot be perfectly happy until man comes home again, and the father-son relationship is complete.

(c). Again, God's concern for man is shown in Jesus Himself. We have pointed out that He believes Himself to be sent by God to perform a specific service to man. He expresses this purpose when He says: "For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mk.10:45, Matt. 20:28). If Jesus is the pre-existent Son of God as the Fourth Gospel suggests (Jn.1:1-2), the fact that He came into the world on any kind of a mission to men, is the strongest kind of evidence as to the value of man in the eyes of God. That the Son of God should have become incarnated in human form is more than a mere compliment to the race; it is a proof of infinite value. That this incarnated Son should take the form of a servant and go about doing good, indicates with even greater emphasis the significance of man in God's sight. And finally, that He

should actually "give his life as a ransom for many", is the crowning tower of evidence. In the words of Professor Stevens, the death of Christ "is, for one thing, "Christ's supreme testimony of the deep concern of God¹ "for man."

(d). God's concern for man is shown also by the fact, previously mentioned in another connection, that Jesus regards service to man as service to God. The verses which apply are Matthew 25:31-46. These verses indicate that the relation between man and God is so close that God regards the welfare of man as practically identical with His own. When an intimate relationship exists between people, they frequently identify themselves with each other's experiences. The parent is grateful for any kindness to his children, and resents an insult; the husband rejoices in his wife's pleasures, and shares her sorrows; the fortune or misfortune of one member of the family is felt to be the experience of all. Such an identification of interests seems to be involved in the verses mentioned above. Man's value to God is so great that an offense to man is an offense to God, and a favor to man is a favor to God.

1. Stevens, 'The Teaching of Jesus', p.148.

(D). The last fragment of evidence that we shall consider with reference to Jesus' estimate of the worth of man in the sight of God is the fact that He speaks of God in human terms. We have seen that His usual name for God is 'Father'; He compares God to a judge (Lk.18:2-18), to a shepherd (Lk.15:4-6), to a housekeeper (Lk.15:8-10), and to the father of the prodigal son (Lk.15:11-32). Moreover, the term which He uses most frequently for Himself is the 'Son of Man'. The term seems to be taken from the seventh chapter of Daniel where the hands of the four earthly kingdoms are likened to beasts, and the head of the heavenly kingdom is "one like unto a son of man" (Dn.7:13). But if Jesus speaks of God in human terms, and the name which He uses for Himself is one which identifies Him with men, it is evident that He believes men to have great worth in the sight of God. God can be described in terms of the God-like only.

Summary and Conclusion:

This completes our study of the ways in which Jesus reveals His estimate of man's worth to God. We have seen that this worth is based on God's love for man, and the fact that man is created in the Divine image and has

within him the qualities which will enable him to become a true son of God. We have found further that, because man's value has such a basis, it is shared by all men, the lowest as well as the highest, and it cannot be lost by sin. We have pointed out that Jesus reveals this value by comparing men with the highest of earthly values, by His own attitude toward various classes of men, by His teaching regarding God's great concern for man, and by the fact that He describes God in human terms.

In the light of the above study, Jesus' general estimate of the worth and significance of man in the sight of God is clear. He believes that the importance and value of man in the universe is second only to God Himself. Man is an end, and not a means. The earth on which he lives is to be used for his happiness and highest good. He is a created being, and yet, among all God's creatures, he is supreme. The teaching of Jesus assumes the purpose of God stated in Genesis 1:26: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth." But Jesus goes further than Genesis, for, while assuming man's great importance because he has been created to dominate the

world, He goes on to teach that man is, in a potential sense, and may become, in a real sense, a son or child of God. As a child of God, he shares with God the realm of ultimate ends, and human personality, however low it may have fallen, is the most valuable thing in all the earth.

The emphasis placed on man's worth to God is the most important characteristic which distinguishes Christianity from other great world religions. In the words of Professor James Robertson: "Christianity surpasses all other forms of belief in inspiring those who receive it with an elevating and strengthening sense of the infinite worth of their own being to themselves and to God. And in the actual world of affairs, and in the customary ways of nations, we find, when we survey them, that everywhere respect for human life, concern for the good of men, interest in their happiness, and sympathy for their sufferings, rise in proportion to faith in Jesus and familiarity with His teaching. It is in Christian countries that hospitals for the sick, asylums for the insane, refuges for the tempted, homes for orphaned children, and all the various energies of philanthropy originate and multiply. It is in Christian countries that the lead has been taken

"in the suppression of the slave trade, the abolition of
"slavery, the milder and more just punishment of criminals,
"and the endeavor to make punishment reformatory."¹

These things are undoubtedly true, and it is inevitable that Christianity will always bear this kind of fruit wherever it is understood and appreciated. No other effect is possible for a religion which holds that, next to God, human personality is the supreme value of the universe.

1. James Robertson, 'Our Lord's Teaching', p.44.

BIBLIOGRAPHYAdamson, Thomas.

'Studies in the Mind of Christ', Edinburgh, 1897.

Allen, W.C.'International Critical Commentary' St. Matthew,
Quoted or referred to on pages 51,236,312,320.
Edinburgh, 1896.Andrews, H.T.'The Significance of the Eschatological Utterances of
Jesus'
(London Theological Studies) London, 1911.
Quoted or referred to on pages 244,257,259,261.Bacon, B.W.

'Is Mark a Roman Gospel?' Cambridge, 1909.

Balmforth, Henry.'Is Christian Experience an Illusion?'
London, 1923.Barry, F.R.'Christianity and Psychology' London, 1923.
Quoted or referred to on pages 34,290,333.Beyschlag, Willibald.'New Testament Theology', Vol.I & II.
Edinburgh, 1895.
Quoted or referred to on pages 72,185,271,289,
298,371.Bruce, A.B.

'The Training of the Twelve', Edinburgh, 1877.

Bruce, A.B.

'The Kingdom of God', Edinburgh, 1889.
 Quoted or referred to on pages 163,290,456,457.

Burton, Ernest Dewitt.

'A Source Book for the Study of the Teaching
 of Jesus', Second Ed. Chicago, 1924.

Burton, Ernest Dewitt, Smith, J.M.P. & Smith, G.B.

'Biblical Ideas of Atonement', 1st. Ed.
 Chicago, 1909.

Charles, R.H.

'The Apocalyptic Element in the Teaching of
 Our Lord'
 (A paper read at the Church Congress at
 Cambridge) Cambridge, 1910.

Charles, R.H.

'Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian',
 London, 1899.
 Quoted or referred to on pages 195,241,257,263,
 286.

Clarke, W.N.

'The Outline of Christian Theology',
 New York, 1921.

Clutton-Brock, A.

'Evil and the New Psychology',
 (Essays on Religion) London, 1926.

Coe, G.A.

'The Psychology of Religion', Chicago, 1917.

Coster, Geraldine.

'Psycho-Analysis for Normal People',
 London, 1926.

Crum, J.M.C.

'The Original Jerusalem Gospel', London, 1927.

Dale, R.W.

'The Atonement', Sixth Ed. London, 1877.

Davidson, A.B.

'Old Testament Prophecy', Edinburgh, 1903.
Quoted or referred to on pages 366,367,368.

Davidson, A.B.

'The Theology of the Old Testament',
Edinburgh, 1904.

Dearmer, Percy.

'Body and Soul', London, 1912.

Denney, James.

'The Death of Christ', London, 1902.

Dobschütz, E. Von.,

'The Eschatology of the Gospels', London, 1910.
Quoted or referred to on pages 231,234,241,251,
253.

Dougall, Lily, & Emmet, Cyril W.

'The Lord of Thought', New York, 1922.

Dougall, Lily.

'Pro Christo et Ecclesia', London, 1900.

Dunkerley, Roderic.

'The Unwritten Gospel'. London, 1925.

Fletcher, M. Scott.

'The Psychology of the New Testament',
London, 1912.

Quoted or referred to on pages 39,40,44,60,348.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J.

'The Parting of the Roads', London, 1912.
Quoted on page 220.

Forrest, D.W.

'The Authority of Christ', Edinburgh, 1916.

Forrest, D.W.

'The Christ of History and of Experience',
Edinburgh, 1897.
Quoted or referred to on page 214,

Galloway, George.

'The Philosophy of Religion', Edinburgh, 1914.

Gardner, Percy.

'The Ephesian Gospel', London, 1915.

Gilbert, G.H.

'The Kingdom of God', D.C.G. Vol.I.

Glover, T.R.

'The Jesus of History', London, 1917.

Gould, E.P.

'International Critical Commentary' on St. Mark,
Edinburgh, 1896.
Quoted or referred to on page 217.

Grubb, Edward.

'The Meaning of the Cross', London, 1922.

Hadfield, J.A.

'Psychology and Morals', London, 1923.
Quoted or referred to on pages 133,313,321,322.

Harris, J. Rendel.

'The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel', Cambridge, 1917

Headlam, A.C.

'The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ', London, 1923.
Quoted or referred to on page 44.

Herrmann, W.

'Communion with God', London, 1895.

Hort, Fenton J.A.

'Life and Letters', Vol.II. London, 1896.
Referred to on page 291.

Huck, A.

'Synopsis Der Drei Ersten Evangelien', Tübingen, 1922.

Jackson, Latimer.

'The Problem of the Fourth Gospel', Cambridge, 1918.

Jacks, L.P.

'The Living Universe', London, 1923.
(Hibbert Lectures).
Quoted on page 160.

Jauncey, Ernest.

'The Doctrine of Grace', London, 1925.

Journal of Theology May 1927.

Hoskyns, Edwyn C.

'The Other-worldly Kingdom of God in the New Testament',

Schmidt, K.L.

'The Other-worldly Kingdom of God in Our Lord's Teaching'.

Dodd, C.H.

'The This-worldly Kingdom of God in Our Lord's Teaching'.

Kittel, G.

'The This-worldly Kingdom of God in Our Lord's Teaching'.

Rawlinson, A.E.J.

'The Kingdom of God in the Apostolic Age'.

Vallrath, W.

'The Idea of the kingdom of God in the Ancient Church and the Middle Ages'.

Mozley, J.K.

'The Idea of the Kingdom of God from Luther to the Present Day'.

Frick, Heinrich.

'The Idea of the Kingdom of God from Luther to the Present Day.'

Kantor, J.R.

'Principles of Psychology', Vol.I.
New York, 1924.

Kent, C.F.

'The Life and Teaching of Jesus', London, 1913.
Quoted or referred to on page 245.

King, J.M.

'The Theology of Christ's Teaching',
London, 1902.
Quoted or referred to on page 438.

Laidlaw, John.

'The Bible Doctrine of Man', Edinburgh, 1895.
 Quoted or referred to on pages 25,35,56,57,60,
 68.

Mackintosh, H.R.

'Immortality and the Future Life', London, 1915.

Mackintosh, H.R.

'The Christian Experience of Forgiveness', London, 1927.
 Quoted on page 332.

Manson, Wm.

'Christ's View of the Kingdom of God', London, 1918.
 (Bruce Lectures 1914).
 Quoted on pages 249, 251,276,294.

Mathews, Shailer.

'The Gospel and the Modern Man', New York, 1910.
 Quoted or referred to on page 376.

Mathews, Shailer.

'The Social Teaching of Jesus', New York, 1897.
 Quoted on page 290.

McDougall, Wm.

'An Introduction to Social Psychology', London, 1920.
 Referred to on page 313.

Miller, Crichton.

'The New Psychology and the Parent', London, 1925.

Moffatt, James.

'The Theology of the Gospels', London, 1912.

Quoted or referred to on pages 245,290,292.

Montefiore, C.G.

'The Synoptic Gospels', London, 1909.
Referred to on page 186.

Moore, Aubrey L.

'Some Aspects of Sin', London, 1904.

Muirhead, L.A.

'Eschatology', D.C.G. Vol.I.
Quoted or referred to on page 291.

Muirhead, L.A.

'The Eschatology of Jesus', London, 1904.

Müller, Julius.

'The Christian Doctrine of Sin', Vol.I & II,
Edinburgh, 1853.
Quoted and referred to on page 96.

Murry, J. Middleton.

'The Life of Jesus', London, 1926.
Referred to on page 291.

Northridge, W.L.

'Recent Psychology and Evangelistic
Preaching', London, 1924.

Oesterley, W.O.E. & Box, G.H.

'The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue',
Quoted on page 220. Sec. Ed. London, 1911.

Orchard, W.E.

'Modern Theories of Sin', London, 1909.

Orr, James.

'The Kingdom of God', H.D.B.

Orr, James.

'God's Image in Man', London, 1905.
Quoted or referred to on pages 19,25.

Orr, James.

'The Christian View of God and the World',
Edinburgh, 1893.

Otto Rudolf.

'The Idea of the Holy',
(Translation by J.W. Harvey) Oxford, 1923.

Paterson, W.P.

'The Nature of Religion', London, 1925.

Peake, A.S.

'A Commentary on the Bible', London, 1919.
Referred to on pages 11,217.

Piepenbring, C.H.

'Theology of the Old Testament',
(Translation by H.G. Mitchell) New York, 1893.

Plummer, A.

'International Critical Commentary',
St. Luke. Edinburgh, 1896.
Quoted or referred to on pages 155,203,239.

Pym, T.W.

'Psychology and the Christian Life',
London, 1922.
Referred to on page 34,313.

Pym, T.W.

'More Psychology and the Christian Life',
London, 1925.

Ramsay, Wm.

'The First Christian Century', London, 1911.

Richards, G.W.

'Christian Ways of Salvation', New York, 1923.

Robertson, James.

'Our Lord's Teaching', London, 1895.
Quoted or referred to on pages 405, 468.

Robinson, H. Wheeler.

'The Christian Doctrine of Man', Second Ed. Edinburgh, 1913.
Quoted or referred to on pages 32, 36, 41, 47, 57, 92, 93, 100, 140, 353.

Ross, D.M.

'The Teaching of Jesus', Edinburgh, 1904.
Quoted or referred to on page 287.

Schweitzer, Albert.

'The Quest of the Historical Jesus', London, 1922.
(Translated by W. Montgomery)
Quoted or referred to on page 182.

Scott, D. Russell.

'Christ, Sin, And Redemption', London, 1926.

Scott, E.F.

'The Ethical Teaching of Jesus', London, 1924.

Scott, E.F.

'The Fourth Gospel', Edinburgh, 1906.

Seeley, J.R.

'Ecce Homo', 5th. Ed. London, 1866.
Quoted on page 343.

Selby, Thomas G.

'The Ministry of the Lord Jesus', London, 1896.

Sharman, H.B.

'The Teaching of Jesus About the
Future', Chicago, 1909.
Quoted or referred to on page 243.

Shaw, J.M.

'The Christian Gospel and the Father-
hood of God', London, 1924.

Simpson, J.G.

Article 'Sin', D.C.G. Vol.II.
Quoted on page 294.

Stalker, James.

'Christian Psychology', London, 1914.
Quoted or referred to on page 59.

Stalker, James.

'The Teaching of Jesus Concerning
Himself', 2nd. Edition. London, 1912.
Quoted or referred to on page 287.

Stevens, G.B.

'The Theology of the New Testament',
Edinburgh, 1899.
Quoted or referred to on pages 75,184,409.

Stevens, G.B.

'The Teaching of Jesus', London, 1923.
Quoted on pages 99,284,291,375,404,464.

Streeter, B.H.

'The Four Gospels', London, 1924.
Referred to on page 242.

Strong, A.H.

'Systematic Theology', Philadelphia, 1912.
Quoted or referred to on pages 180,181.

Swete, H.B.

'Critical Commentary on St. Mark',
 London, 1898.
 Quoted or referred to on page 217.

Swete, H.B.

'Studies in the Teaching of Our Lord',
 London, 1904.

Swete, H.B.

'The Holy Spirit in the New Testament',
 London, 1909.
 Quoted on page 49.

Tansley, A.G.

'The New Psychology and Its Relation
 to Life', Ninth Impression. London, 1924.
 Referred to on page 313.

Tennant, F.R.

'The Concept of Sin', Cambridge, 1912.
 Quoted or referred to on page 141.

Tennant, F.R.

'The Origin and Propagation of Sin',
 Cambridge, 1902.
 Quoted or referred to on page 131.

Valentine, Cyril H.

'Modern Psychology and the Validity
 of Christian Experience', London, 1926.
 Referred to on page 34.

Vedder, Henry C.

'The Gospel of Jesus and the
 Problems of Democracy', New York, 1914.

Walker, Thomas.

'What Jesus Read', London, 1925.
 Referred to on page 257.

Walker, Thomas.

'The Teaching of Jesus and the
Jewish Teaching of His Age', London, 1923.
Quoted or referred to on pages 214,291,448.

Walker, W.L.

'The Cross and the Kingdom', Edinburgh, 1902.

Weiss, Bernhard.

'Biblical Theology of the New
Testament', Vol.I & II. Edinburgh, 1893.
Quoted or referred to on pages 73,79,342,397.

Wendt, H.H.

'The Teaching of Jesus', Vol.I & II.
(Translated by Rev. John Wilson) Edinburgh, 1893.
Quoted or referred to on pages 35,51,52,72,
74,76,114,291,338,340,399,421,423.

Wernle, Paul.

'The Beginnings of Christianity', London, 1903-4.

Williams, N.P.

'The Ideas of the Fall and of
Original Sin', London, 1927.
(Bampton Lectures)
Quoted on page 125.

Genesis

Page

Ch.

1:26-27-----	23,466
2:7-----	51
2:24-----	69
9:6-----	23- 25
12:1-3-----	196
15:18-----	196
17:23-----	219
20:5-----	57
42:28-----	57

Exodus

Ch. 7:23-----	57
9:14-----	57
20:12-----	155
20:17-----	219- 459
28:3-----	57

Leviticus

Ch. 17:11-----	59
----------------	----

Deuteronomy

Ch. 4:9-----	57
5:16-----	155
6:5-----	43, 62
7:17-----	57

Judges

Ch. 18:20-----	57
----------------	----

I Samuel

Ch. 1:8-----	57
2:35-----	57
4:13-----	57
16:7-----	57
25:36-----	57

II Samuel

Ch. 14:1-----	57
7:14-----	395

I Kings

482

Ch.

3:9-----	57
----------	----

Psalms

Ch. 2:7-----	395
51:10-----	61
68:5-----	395
77:6-----	53
89:26-----	395
103:13-----	395
106:33-----	53

Proverbs

Ch. 17:27-----	53
----------------	----

Isaiah

Ch. 6:9-10-----	184,185
19:14-----	53
26:9-----	55
29:18-----	237
35:5-6-----	237
42:1-3-----	364
49:6-----	371
53:3-----	368
53:10-----	367
61:1-----	237
53:2-3-----	364

Ezekiel

Ch. 3:14-----	53
---------------	----

Daniel

Ch. 2:1-49-----	287
7:13-----	288,465

Hosea

Ch. 11:1-----	395
---------------	-----

Ch. III

2-----78,333
 5-9-----199
 16-----218
 17-----401

44,45-----398,409
 45---2,182,311,402 403
 47-----423
 48-----311, 426

Ch. IV

1-11-----105
 3-10-----137
 4-----372
 10-----89
 12,17-----218
 17--78,126,284, 333
 19-----439

Ch. V

3-----49,384, 458
 3-11-----112
 4-----89
 4-10----100,235,---236
 5-----433
 7-----433
 8-----59, 60
 8,28-----433
 9-----402, 403
 10-----307,412, 434
 10-12-----437
 11,44-----339
 12-----89,322, 324
 13-----438
 14-----379, 438
 16-----379, 438
 17-----454
 17-18-----130
 18-----139
 19-----122, 212
 20-28-----104
 21-48-----205
 22-----89, 160
 22,24-----421
 27-----140
 27,28-----148
 28---59,60,62,64, 105
 29-----161
 42-----306
 43,48-----433
 44-----177,355 379

Ch. VI

1-6-----148
 6-8-----355
 8-32-----311
 9-----311
 9-13-----354
 10-----295
 12-----135,152, 311-----333
 12,14,15-----150, 300
 13-----245, 301
 14-15-----135, 153
 19-----339
 19,24-----255
 19,25,30-----306
 25-----42
 25-34-----88, 90
 26-----452 461
 26,28-----351
 27-----90
 28-----311
 28,30-----451
 30-----461, 21
 31-----461
 33-----316, 317

Ch. VII

3-----421
 3-5-----158
 7-8-----114, 178
 7-11-----355
 9-11-----461
 11---98,126,130,132, 351
 12-----306, 316 433
 13-----161
 15-----153
 15-18-----97
 18---98,107,109,127,132,157,
 301, 318 149
 21---143,178,213,245,134 285
 21-22-----61
 24-----212
 25 34-----351

Ch.VIII

Page

10-----	348
10-13-----	343
11-12-----	222, 242
12-----	161, 163, 324
14-----	341
26-----	21
28-----	77

Ch. IX

2-8-----	155
2, 22, 29-----	343, 348
4-----	59, 63
6-----	150
10-11-----	429, 457
13-----	15, 126, 457
14-15-----	104
32-33-----	76
37-38-----	99
38-----	355

Ch. X

3-----	457
5-6-----	203
5-42-----	250
7-----	378
13-----	275, 335
15, 28-----	161
16, 17, 18-----	434
16-23-----	437
20-----	107
23-----	242, 339
26-28-----	105
27-----	378
28-----	45, 46, 54
29-----	21, 311
29-31-----	88, 452
30-----	461
32-----	285, 353
32, 33-----	212, 350, 378
34-36-----	434
34-37-----	102
35, 37-----	340, 136
35-37-----	340
36-----	137
37-----	89
39-----	42, 45, 46
41-----	126

Ch. XI

484

2-6-----	373
5-----	458
5, 11-12-----	235 237
6-----	112
15-----	91
19-----	457, 339
20-----	126, 134
20-24-----	145, 373
21-----	112, 130, 178, 335
21, 23, 31-----	457
21-24-----	173
22, 24-----	108, 161
25-----	211
25-27-----	397
28-----	213
28-30-----	320, 345
29-----	45, 59, 91
34-----	59

Ch. XII

1-13-----	104
2-8-----	453
3-----	201
7-----	15, 91
9-----	201
10-13-----	139
11-12-----	452
17-21-----	364
22-----	76
26-----	71
28--235, 236, 293, 294, 302, 373	
28-29-----	73
29-----	79
32-----	89, 127, 212
34, 35-----	110
35-----	59, 132
38-42-----	373
39-41-----	14, 201, 214
40-----	58, 245
41-----	334, 372
42-----	14
44-----	301
48-49-----	423
50-----	134, 212, 423

Ch. XIII

3-23-----	110
9-----	91
10-15-----	183

11-----	311
12-----	212
13-19-----	91
14-----	185
15-----	60 63 64
18-----	75
20-----	89
21-----	339, 437
22-----	91
24-30-----	75, 432
33-----	439
42-43-----	324
43-----	397, 403
45-46-----	337
47-50-----	432
54-----	201
58-----	343

Ch.XIV

5-----	105
16-30-----	90

Ch.XV

2-3-----	104
6-----	91
8-----	64
12 14-----	159
14-16-----	91
19-----	60, 63
24-----	151 203
28-----	343 348

Ch.XVI

1-4-----	373
4-----	214
8-----	70
11-12-----	437
12-----	90
14-----	91
17-----	68 112
18-----	455
18-19-----	254
23-----	74 301
24-----	345
25-----	42 45 46 137 212
26-----	45
28-----	246 310

5-----	401
14-18-----	76
15-----	106
16-----	90
27-----	90 103 136 340

Ch.XVIII

3-----	129, 460
5-----	460
6-----	147 152
7-----	112
8-9-----	161
10-----	89
11-----	151 457
12-----	213
13-----	89
14-----	399
17-----	455
17-18-----	254
19-----	273 355
21, 35-----	421
22-----	153
24-27, 30-----	90
35-----	300

Ch.XIX

4-----	201
4-6-----	140
5-----	136
5-6-----	69 90
8-----	110 132, 138
12-----	90 91 340
14-----	460 129
16 22-----	162
17-----	109 178
21-----	340
21-26-----	113
23-24-----	136
24-----	137
25-----	342
28-----	242
45-----	20

Ch.XX

1-16-----	176
4 6 7 13-----	89
10-----	89
16-----	183 213
21-----	273
28-----	42 463
32-----	89

Ch. XXI

Page

9-----	89
12-----	90
21-----	91
22-----	355
24-----	173
26 46-----	105
28-31-----	349
37-----	401
43-----	296

Ch. XXII

1-14-----	214
13-----	324
18 42-----	89
21-----	90 103 340
31 32-----	310
37-----	43 62 70
37-39-----	316
43-----	14 49

Ch. XXIII

2-4,34-----	90
8-----	423
13-----	238
13,16-----	112
14-----	162
15-----	216
16-----	126
16,17,19-----	159
27-----	132
29-33-----	130
33-----	161
34-----	437
35-----	20 130145 201
37-----	146 178

Ch. XXIV

14---234 275 322	372
14 27-----	242
22-----	68
22 24 31-----	182
30-----	246
35-----	372
37-39-----	201
37-41-----	242
46-----	112
48-----	254
51-----	324

Ch. XXV

486

1-46-----	145
15-----	91
19-----	254
21,23-----	322, 324
30-----	324
31-46-----	242, 464
32-----	222
34-----	324
40-----	421, 427
46-----	162, 324

Ch. XXVI

6-13-----	430
13-----	254, 322
19-----	201
24-----	112
26-29-----	354
28-----	376
38-----	43
41--50,53,54,55,69,	355
63-64-----	401
64-----	246

Ch. XXVII

43-----	401
---------	-----

Ch. XXVIII

10-----	423
18-20-----	379
19-----	217,372, 397

Ch. I

9-----	218
14-15-----	234
15--78,126,143,177,	284
322,333,343,344,	372
23-26-----	76
30-----	341
35-----	354

Ch. II

3 12-----	155
5-----	348
8-----59, 63,	70
10-----	150
15-16-----429,	456
17-----126,	457
18-20-----104,	206
20-----266,	374
23-28---104,139,	205
24-28-----	453
25-----14,	201

Ch. III

4-----	42
5-----61	64
15-----	177
22-27-----	71
23-----	72
27-----	90
28-29-----	266
29-----127,141,	163
32-35-----	341
33-34-----	423
35-----134,212,	412

Ch. IV

3-20-----	110
9-19-----	91
11-----	311
11-12-----179,	183
13-----91,	96
14-----	371
16-----	346
17-----339,	437
20-----	344
25-----	212
26-27-----	296
26-29-----	272

26-29,30,32-----	234
28-----	352
39-----	21

Ch. V

2-5-----	77
34-----343,	348

Ch. VI

6-----	97
11-----	266
12-----	126
35-44-----	105
46-----	354
52-----	64
56-----	303

Ch. VII

1-15-----	104,205
6-----	64
10-11-----	104
20-23-----	132
21-----	63
21-22-----144,	337
22-----	148
25-30-----	202
27-----	207

Ch. VIII

11-12-----	373
17-----64,	70
29-----	201
31-35-----	377
33-----74,	126
34-----	345
35-----42,45,46,	137
212, 322,	338
36-37-----	45
38-----	250
38-9:1-----240,	241

Ch.VX

1-----	275
246,249,	273
12-----	364
13-----	201
17-26-----	76
18-----	106
35-----	245
37-----	460
43-----	160, 163
47-----	240, 273

Ch.X

2-12-----	459
4-----	234
5-----	110
6-7-----	20
6-9-----	140
7-----	136
7-8-----	69
8-----	90
14-----	265, 460
14-15-----	129
15-----	347, 460
16-----	130, 201
17-----	286
17-19-----	285
17-22-----	162
18-----	109
23-----	286
23-27-----	113
23-24-----	339
24-25-----	136
26-----	342
27-----	386
28-----	339
29-----	322
37-----	240, 273, 297
38-----	91
43-----	89
44-----	177
45-----	42, 375, 463
52-----	343, 348

Ch.XI

14-----	76
18,32-----	105
22-----	345
23-----	59, 63, 91
25-----	135, 153, 300

25-26-----	150, 311
------------	----------

Ch.XII

3-31-----	285
12-----	105
14-17-----	90
15-----	147
17-----	340
25-27-----	310
30-----	62
30,33-----	43
30-33-----	70
34-----	234, 235, 265
40-----	163
42-43-----	458
42-44-----	431

Ch.XIII

1-37-----	240, 273
7-8,14-20,24-27,30-31--	241
10-----	243
10,30,32-----	275
11-----	316
14-----	249
19-----	20
20-----	68
20,22,27-----	182
26-----	213, 246, 276
27,34-----	274
28-----	91
30-----	261
31-----	276, 344
32-----	397

Ch.XIV

3-----	339
3-9-----	430
9-----254, 322,	379
15-----	75
16-----	201
21-----	112
22-25-----	354
24-----	376
25-----240,	241
32 f -----	354
34-----	43
36-----	397
38-----50, 53, 55,	69
62-----240, 241, 246, 249	

Ch.XVI

10-----	89
15-----184, 213, 322,	379
16-----143, 178,	217

Luke

Ch.I

1-----	9
5-----	156
51-----	64

Ch.II

40-----	199
51-----12,	64
52-----	13

Ch.III

21-----	218
---------	-----

Ch.IV

1-13-----	105
3-12-----	137
21-----	364
31-32-----	372
33-35-----	76
38-----	341
38-39-----	76

Ch.V

16-----	354
18-26-----	155
20-----	348
20-24-----	150
22-----63, 70	
27-----	457
29-30-----	429, 456
32-----	457
33-35-----	104

Ch.VI

1-10-----	104
3-----14,	201
3-5-----	453
9-----	42
20-----50, 285,	458
20-22-----	112
20-23-----235,	236
24-26-----	100, 112
25-----	89
26-----	89
35-----402,	403
35-36-----	311
39-----91, 158,	159
41-42-----	421
46-----	245

Ch.VII

9, 50-----	348
11-15-----	310
18-23-----	373
22-----	303
22-23-----235-	237
23-----	112
28-----236,	237
34-----339,	457
38-----	336
41-----	90
47-----	336
47-49-----	150
50-----	343

Ch.VIII

3-----340,	430
5-15-----	110
8-18-----	212

Ch.XIV

3-----	339
3-9-----	430
9----254, 322,	379
15-----	75
16-----	201
21-----	112
22-25-----	354
24-----	376
25-----240,	241
32 f -----	354
34-----	43
36-----	397
38----50, 53, 55,	69
62-----240, 241, 246, 249	

Ch.XVI

10-----	89
15----184, 213, 322,	379
16---143, 178,	217

Luke

Ch.I

1-----	9
5-----	156
51-----	64

Ch.II

40-----	199
51-----	12, 64
52-----	13

Ch.III

21-----	218
---------	-----

Ch.IV

1-13-----	105
3-12-----	137
21-----	364
31-32-----	372
33-35-----	76
38-----	341
38-39-----	76

Ch.V

16-----	354
18-26-----	155
20-----	348
20-24-----	150
22-----63, 70	
27-----	457
29-30-----	429, 456
32-----	457
33-35-----	104

Ch.VI

1-10-----	104
3-----14, 201	
3-5-----	453
9-----	42
20-----50, 285,	458
20-22-----	112
20-23-----235,	236
24-26-----100,	112
25-----	89
26-----	89
35-----402,	403
35-36-----	311
39-----91, 158,	159
41-42-----	421
46-----	245

Ch.VII

9, 50-----	348
11-15-----	310
18-23-----	373
22-----	303
22-23-----235-	237
23-----	112
28-----236,	237
34-----339,	457
38-----	336
41-----	90
47-----	336
47-49-----	150
50-----	343

Ch.VIII

3-----340,	430
5-15-----	110
8-18-----	212

Ch.VIII (Contd.)

9,10-----	183
10-----	311
12-----	59, 75
14-----	91
20,21-----	341
21-----	212, 423
24-----	21
25-----	91
28-29-----	77
48-----	343, 348

Ch.IX

12-17-----	90
23-----	213, 345
24---42,45,46,	212
26-----	250
27-----	246, 249
39-----	106
42-----	76
48-----	460
52-56-----	215
53-----	199
55-----	91
58-----	339
59-62-----	340

Ch.X

2-----	355
12-14-----	161
12-15-----	173
13---112,130,178,	335
13-16-----	145
20-----	89
22-----	397
25-37-----	162, 410
27-----	43,62, 70
30-37-----	433
30-38-----	145

Ch.XI

4-----	126, 153
9-10-----	114, 178
13-----	355
14-----	76
17-22-----	235
18-----	71

20-----	293
20-22-----	73
29-30-----	214, 373
29-32-----	14
31-----	14
31-32-----	108
42-44-----	130
42,44,46-----	145
42,44,46,47,52---	112, 126
42---52-----	100
46-----	90
49-----	437
51-----	20, 130
52-----	238

Ch.XII

1-----	152
5-----	161
7-----	452
8-----	353
8,9-----	212, 378
10-----	127,141, 212
15-----	148
16-21-----	339
19-----	44
20-----	45
22-----	42
23-----	45
24-----	452
32-----	176,183,243,264, 296,355
37,38,43-----	112
42-----	242
45-----	63, 254
50-----	377

Ch.XIII

3,5,-----	126
15-16-----	452
16--106,155,157,	304
20-21-----	238
28-----	324
28-29-----	242
32-----	103
34-----	345
34-35-----	97

Ch.XIV

5-----	452
13-----	458
16-24-----	214
20-----	90
21-----	89
26-----136,	240

Ch.XV

4-6-----	465
4,6,8,9,13,32-----	151
4,8,11,12-----	213
5-----	89
7-----462,150,299,	450
7,8,9,	
8-----	362
8,9-----	462
8-10-----	465
10-----	426
11-32---295,398,	465
14-----	362
18,21-----	141
19-----	403
20-----	426
21-----	150
28-----	89

Ch.XVI

5-7-----	90
15-----	59
16-----	235,237
23-----161,	163
47-----	355

Ch.XVII

1-----	112
2-----	147
3-----	421
19-----	348
20-21-----	238
21-----	292
26-27-----	161
33-----42,45,46,	137
34-----	242

1-----	245,355
2-18-----	465
11-----	158
13-----	158,336
13-14-----	353
14-----	99
16-----	460
16-17-----	129
17-----	347 460
18-23-----	162
19-----	109
24-----	339
24-27-----	113
26-----	342
29-30-----	324
42-----	348

Ch.XX

6-----	222
19-----	105
20-25-----	340
22-25-----	90
35-36-----	310
36-----	402,403
46-----	89
47-----	163

Ch.XXI

1-4-----	431
3-----	458
12-----	437
14-----	63
19-----	45
20-----	249
27-----	246

Ch.XIX omitted

9-----	99,203,
	208
10---151,213,362,	457
21-----	105
25-----	44

18:7-----	182
-----------	-----

Ch.XXII

2-----	105
13-----	201
14-20-----	354
20-----	376
22-----	112
26-----	245
29-30-----	242
31-----	74
37-----	364
42-----	412
69---246,-----	249

Ch.XXIII

34-----	135, 150
46-----	50

Ch.XXIV

25-----	61, 63
29-----	107
38-----	63
39-----	67
47-----	222
52-----	322

John

Ch.

1:1-2-----	463
3:8-----	48, 387
3:15-----	285
3:16-----	426
4:2-----	218
4:24-----	55, 56
4:21-24-----	209
4:36-----	285
5:39-----	285
6:15-----	297
6:44-----	377
6:54, 60-----	285
8:12-----	370
12:32-----	377
14:1, 27-----	62
16:6, 22-----	69
17:2-----	285

Ch.

1:6-8-----	261
2:38, 41-----	218
3:12-----	218
10:34-----	204
13:48-----	285
15:9-----	61
16:31-----	350

The Romans

2:7-----	285
5:21-----	285
6:23-----	285
8:16-----	56

I Corinthians

15:44-----	53
15:44-46-----	70

Galatians

2:11-----	107
-----------	-----

I Timothy

6:12, 19-----	285, 286
---------------	----------